✓ Preserve

App F IX 4

1933 (Mujraj)

File No 335-33

Serial Nos 1—12

Previous References

Mej 146-13-1-4
" 156-1907-08
Mej 178-29-1-11

Later References

Mej 144-35-1-2 1:110
Law 143-35-1
Army 193-38 (1-4)

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Serial Nos 12

Part B for August-35

SUBJECT

Review re the tenancy of Devi Lal Mutt lands

Mr K N Srinivasan Advocate for the Revenue Petitioner No 89 P 28-31

S/12

WD 01965—GPB—15 000—7 7-34

Passes orders on the revenue petition

Muz Revn no 9 of 1933-34 (1)
re the tenancy of Degita Mutt lands

General and Revenue Secretariat | Muz File No 331 of 1933 | [App F III—2

Serial No	
	Petition dy 19 10 33 filed by Mr K T Bhashyam Iyengar Advocate for the petitioners Hangegowda and others residing in Kankanhalli stating that the decision in Muz Appl no 27 of 29-30 was passed without hearing them and praying that they may be heard in support of their case before final orders are passed
	Petition dy 19 10 33 filed by Mr R N Srinivasan Advocate for Bandi Malleiya, the petitioner stating that if the Government had inspected his title deeds and other documents their decision would not have been the same and praying for reasons detailed therein that pending disposal of the Review petition a stay order may kindly be granted
2	Petition dy 19- 10 33

NOTE—Contn Sheet

WD 0434—GPB—15 000—12-10-32

File No of 193

General and Revenue Secretariat

Serial No

Serial No

3 filed by Mr K T Bhashyam Deputy Advocate for the petitioners Stong c Gowda & others of Kankanhalli Stating that the enforcement of the order passed in regard to lands belonging to Sri Digala Mutt of Kankanhalli would entail great loss and miscarriage of justice and praying that a Stay order would maintain the Status quo which has prevailed for over a hundred and odd years

1 Minute of the Member of Council on P W D I —
Presented by Mr K T Bhashyam
Note,

1) Stay asked for
Minute on P W D II —
Presented by the Advocate.
Stay order asked for.

It is against the decision of the Rev in Misc Appl No 6 of 28-29 on the file of the Court (Certified Copy of which has already been produced by the petitioners) that the present petitioners filed an appeal here on 16 12 29. The Case was for the first time heard on 7 7 30 when the result detailed in para 23 of the Note. Again it was posted for a few

x A.

x 8. Flag B Misc 178-29

NOTE—Contn Sheet

38

M 113 File No ~~1478~~ 333 of 1930 33

General and Revenue Secretariat

at 14 11-30 when owing to an objection raised by one of the Advocates for the petitioners The Case was not proceeded with. The D.C. Bangalore was directed to hold a formal enquiry as directed in the minutes of the Hon'ble Member of Council (Vide para 38 - page 11 of the note) In this office letter no 1184 of 26/11/30 a Cowhamshire report was called for from the D.C. The report received from the D.C through D.C is flagged N. On receipt of the report that it is noted that orders as in the decision flagged Y were passed without the case being posted for a hearing & after taking the opinion of the Law Secy in regard to the titles of the petitioners to the lands in question. (Vide paras 64-83 supra) The petitioners represent in para 8 of the Pl D.T that they were given no opportunity to put such facts before The Court.

2 Further it will be seen from the enclosure to P.W.D I that the local authorities are taking steps to lease the lands for a period of 10 years at Rs a rate of Rs 30/- per acre.

× E (Mem 178-29)

× R (Mem 178-29)

Mem 178-29)

M-

J

Re Wagaila Mills lands in Kantamallai (Est

Mrs renewal of 3332-34

General and Revenue Secretariat

File No 478 335 of 1929 33

[App F III—2

Serial No

In these Circumstances the request of the petitioners for a hearing and the issue of a Stay order is respectfully submitted —

GS

25/10 3) Mr K T Bheryam Advocate on behalf of Hodgson and others has issued a notice in respect of the possession of the lands, which is the subject matter of this file. The very same individuals have filed a petition (through their advocate) as in Pud I and have asked for a stay order as in Pud III

4) The file relating to the issue of the notice received from the Protection Branch is herewith linked & submitted for orders

Kello

26/10/33 5) Land Revenue wrote to the Members numbers at paras 46, & 57/61 supra and the legal opinion at paras 64 to 83. In view of these clear petns have (No case further in view of the notice issued by the Govt petns (vide linked file) it is for Consideration why the Revenue petns should be kept of the Stay order asked for not granted & the threatened Suit awaited Law Dept be consulted

A. Maybee

26/10/33

(2 Members) 26.10.33

WD 70—GIPN 14-60 000—13-8 31

The Govt Counsel may be asked to file the notice

No Stay order

1 Jt 8/11/33 The case may be posted on 10/11/33 at 10.30 A.M.

NOTE—Contra Sheets

DS)

Kaiballi

General and Revenue Secretariat

File No 193

Dll receipt Bank 113 hbd - Apr Cattle
Govt to return of records sent with this
Office Memo no 14729 dy 11 4 33
in case for disposal [illegible] Records are
Qs necessary as the case is moved for being posted
[illegible] by the Learned -]

10
dy
3/11

No 627 dy 9 11 33 to Mess
K T Bhashyam Iyengar & K
K N Sumitra an Advocates
of Anjarakandy intimating that
no Stay order Case queen
No 625 dy 9 11 33 Head
Magistrate Cannanore Calling
for records returned to

General and Revenue Secretariat — File No 3 55 of 1935

Serial No

6

Petition dy 23 11 33 presented by Mr K N Srinivasan Advocate Bangalore city on behalf of his client Bandi Mallaiya stating that subject to orders that may be passed on his review application re the Dagila Mutt lands cultivated by him he is ready to execute any Muchalika in favour of Government obeying the orders of Government and praying that he may be restored with possession of the garden in his cultivation -

11) Dft rule as directed —

GS 23/11

12) Put up Dft rule issued

23/11/33

13) Dft rule issued

GS 24/11

14) Fit for submit

24/11/33

15) Issue

24/11/33

741 dy 25/11/33 to the Deputy Commissioner stating that the petitioner Bandi Mallaiya may be allowed to

TYPING SECTION — 5 NOV 33 — G.L. & REV SEC.

Continue to be in possession of the lands belonging to Sri Degita Mutt Kankanhalli and held by him subject to the executing the Muteshalika referred to therein

Memo No 742 dt 25-11-33 to Mr K N Srinivasan Advocate Bangalore city forwarding copy of the above

Petition dt 23.12-33 filed on 27.12-33 by Mr K N Srinivasan Advocate Bangalore city on behalf of his clients Honge Gowda & four others, lessees of lands belonging to Sri Degita Mutt stating that subject to the orders that may be passed on their revision application they are ready to execute any Muteshalika in favour of the Government obeying their orders and praying that the S.D.O. Closepet to restore possession of the gardens on their executing the Muteshalika

16) The main file has been sent to the 2nd Member of Council in a separate case regarding Banjar Hakkai. The lessees has been allowed to continue to be in possession of the lands held

Stay order application in respect of Sri Segila Mills lands (8

General and Revenue Secretariat — File No — of 193 — [App F III—2

Serial No

by him subject to terms specified in this office letter no 741 of 25/11/33

1) Now the remaining appl petrs have prayed for a stay order as in cases b to g inc, P & D, under the circumstances detailed in para 4 of the P & D

GS No 18 for orders 7/12

9

- 1) the same treatment as was accorded to Sundr Mallappa petn may be accorded to this also - Put up draft to me & the Lawyer for comment 9/12

2) Dft dtd as directed

GS 9/12

Helvig)

2nd Asst)

21) For affirm 9/12

22) 9/12

3490 11/12

23) JM 10/12

TYPING SECTION 12 DEC 1933 GENL & REV SECTT

9 No 811 dt 12-12-33 to the magistrate Coondapoor intimating that the petitioners may be allowed to continue in possession of the lands referred to therein subject to the orders of the Mutsaddi as prescribed therein

NOTE—Contn Sheet

WD 0246/-GPB—15 000—22 8-32

1(40) Re: Begila Mutt Lands, —1—

Mzz File No 1835 of 1933 | General and Revenue Secretariat

Memo no 812 of 12 12 33 to mr K N. Srinivasan Advocate for warding Copy of the above -

Petition of 23 12-33 from Messrs Honegowda, Chikk Naigowda & Nanja praying for a renewal of orders passed in Mzz ASSM 27 of 29-30 - in connection with Inam lands endowed to Sri Begila Mutt - Kankanhalli - 10

Letter no 649/33-34 of 7-2-34 from the Muzrai Commissioner submitting records connected with Begila Mutt lands, Kankanhalli 11

25) The grounds urged by the petitioners in P u D IV are as follows -

i) that they have been in possession of the lands under the authority of deeds executed by the Swamis of the Mutt paying regularly the Inam due to the Mutt

ii) that on complaints of the Swamis regular enquiry was held, the R-C passed orders to the effect that the land question might be leased out to them for a period of not less than 30 yrs on payment of Rs 30/- per acre & that the Commissr of the appeal before Govt upholding the orders of the R-C has worked hard on them -

P u D IV

Govt may see the records. 16/11

General and Revenue Secretariat — Mysore File No 335 of 1933 — [App F III—2

Serial No

111) That it takes nearly 10 to 12 yrs after planting a cocoanut tree to begin to yield crop & 20 yrs or less a proper yield has to be realised from that plant

2b The case has already been ordered to be posted for a hearing (Vide para 113 supra) & thus will be included in the list of cases to be posted for a hearing on 23rd of this month

× R

2) In this office letter no 118x7 of 26/11/30, the D C. Bangalore was asked to personally go into the matter, hold a formal enquiry & furnish a detailed report in the matter through the R.C. &

× Paper flag

2d) The facts as set forth in D-C's ~~letter~~ report 117a x 1/29-3 of 4-5-32 addressed to the R-C, the present Second Member of Council. (Flag N) & the statements, enclosed to the report & the orders passed in the appeal case before said are flagged - & While the R C had held in para 3 of his order of 10x 8/29 as follows —

"Excepting S Nos 274 and 275 in the possession of Bandi Mallaiah, S No 277 in the holding of Honge Gowda & No 278 in the possession of Mallaradhya the remaining S Nos have all been leased out subsequent to 1853. x

& in para 6 he has ordered as follows: —

The present holdings should pay to the Munic

NOTE—Contn Sheet

WD 0484—GPB—15 000—12-10-32

11) Mrs Review 9 of 1923-24

Mrs File No of 193 | General and Revenue Secretariat | Serial No

a reasonable rent in which case the lands may be continued to them for a fairly long period say even 30 years

x x x x x x »

While dismissing the appeal preferred before Court, it has been ordered that there are no reasons to interfere with the above order of the M-C in respect of the duration of the lease viz 30 years

29 The parties in P & O I + II contend that they have been in possession of certain lands before 1853 & that the lands be continued to them on payment of amounts & the like as before They further urge that this aspect of the case has not been considered in the previous order

30 The parties in P & O III & IV urge that they have improved the said lands in question & they have been at a considerable cost & submit that it is unjust & inequitable to deprive them of the lands —

31 Alienations prior to 1853 & those that were effected after 1853 have all been detailed in the statement rendered from the D C Bangalore vide his elaborate & exhaustive report dt 4-5-32 N Alienations prior to 1853 are retainable under Sec 30 of the present Mysore Inst's Regn VII of 1927 ; re- the said

Mng Review 9 of 33-34 re Degola (12) -
" Kambanhalli

General and Revenue Secretariat — Mng File No 335 of 1933-4 — [App F III—2

Serial No	
	long leases of 30 yrs as ordered by the C A upheld here are allowable
	G.S 5/8/34
	34) P 5/8/34
	Posted to Tuesday the 14th Aug 1934
	Adjourned to 17th Aug 34
	33) Resp^ts request an adj^t for engaging a lawyer - Posted to 17th augt
	G.S 9.8 4/8
	Counsel present Counsel for pet^r
	34) Heard parties & adjourned to Wednesday the 22nd inst (Augt) at 4 P.M for further hearing
	Adjourned to 29th Sept^r 34
	35) adj^d from 29th August to 24th Nov^r
	Adjourned to 24th Nov^r 34
	G.S 29/9/34
	36) Parties & Counsel present Heard Counsel & reserved the appellant in reply Orders reserved
	24/11/34

NOTE—Contn Sheet

WD 0434—GPB—15 000—12-10-33

File No of 193

General and Revenue Secretariat

Serial No

Serial No

Mur Appeal No 9 & 33-34
24/11/34

Respts argument (24-11-34)

No reason to reverse as matters were fully discussed by Sat

On merits no case the basis is that there is no adverse poss as tenants are tenants at will Sunaffas case 4 Mys L J 295
44 Madras -

Section - mur legn does not permit alienations beyond the life of the head of the mutt - No adverse poss by tenants

As regards agreemt re alienations before 1853, none of the applts got lands from the mutt straight after 1853 - Moreover they were all paying some Sultan also they are inferior holders so - Most of the alienations are by tenants & not by mutt itself - & were mostly made after 1853.

Permt leases do not come under the proviso

Ch Com's notifn cant be applied to cases of tenancy & leases

No desire to increase the period of lease to more than 10 yrs

Mr KT B's reply -
(1) Review permissible
2) order 90 has not taken permt tenants into acct
Adverse poss is not claimed but we have not long leases are alienations p 223 mur manual - also 223 - proviso of sec 30 so be given to us - M.C says some mr were alienated before 53 - cases cited apply -
I am not claiming adverse poss - I am claiming only the benefit of the proviso to Sec 30 do not

NOTE—Contn Sheet

WD 2165—GPB— 00—27-5 32

Muz Review 9 of 1933-34 — re the tenancy of Deepla meete lands Kankanarey

Serial No

This is an application for the review of the orders of Government dismissing the appeal by the petitioners against the order of the Muzrai Commisioner in Appeal No 6 of 1928-29, The facts of the case and the reasons for the decisions are fully stated in the previous order, and need not be repeated The main contentions of the appellant's counsel was that though the petitioners did not claim by right of adverse possession, they ~~petitioners~~ should be given the benefit of the proviso to Section 30 of the Muzrai Regulation According to the proviso, ~~the~~ The alienations made prior to 31st January 1853 shall be dealt with in accordance with the Inam Rules contained in the Chief Commissioner's Notification No 266, dated the 17th November 1857 This must have reference to alienations which are recognizable under the law and in which a title has been secured by an alienee The leases under which the petitioners are alleged to be in possession now do not come under this category Many of them are leases given after 1853 and those given at an earlier date are not recognizable under the law, as explained in the previous order I cannot accept the petitioner's contention and see no reason therefore to modify the orders of Government passed previously

It was stated in the order dated the 11th April 1933 that it would be equitable to allow the petitioners to have in the first instance fairly long leases of lands on gutta amounts The Counsel for the respondent stated that he had no objection to this

WD 01536—GPB—7 500—5 4 34

Muzrai Review Petn no 9 of 1933-34 re Devasthanam
(15) Pandrin Kanbagalli 872/33

File No 935 of 1933-4 | General and Revenue Secretariat

The Muzrai Commissioner will be requested to keep this aspect in mind when the question of the period of new leases to be granted comes for decision

702
26/7

JPV 26/7

Ltr 26/7/35

L 26/7

submitted with a draft.

L.s 27/7

27/7

L 27/7

No 89 of 28-35 to Mr A N Srinivasaraghava Advocate for the Revenue Petitioner in (2) 12 forwarding Copy of the decision

No 90 of 28-35 to Hoige Gopala and others C/o Mr K. T. Bhashyam Ayyangar Advocate for Certain others forwarding Copy of the decision

No 91 of 28-35 to Mr K Venkatarama Reddy Advocate for the Counter petitioner forwarding Copy of the decision

No 92 of 2-8-35 to the Muzrai Commissioner forwarding Copy of the Decision

No 93 of 28-35 to Law Section forwarding Copy of the order.

TYPING 23 JUL 1935 GEN'L & REV SECTT

BB 28/7 13/8 L



GENL & FEV 428 1 OCT 1933

16

2312

19/10

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE

MAHARAJA OF MYSORE, BANGALORE

Muz 335-337

Muz Review Petn No 9 of 1933-34

PETITIONERS -(Appellants)

1 HONGE GOVDA, son of Kempa Kala,

2 MALLARI RAO, son of Subbanna,

3 VENKATAPPA, son of Subbaiya,

4 VENKATARAMAIYA, son of Puttaramanna,

5 GURIKAR VENKATARAMANE GOWDA, son of Chickkathimme Gowda,

All residing in KANKANHALLI

-Vs-

OPPONENT -(Respondent)

SRI NIRVANASWAMI GURUGALU, Sri Degila Mutt, KANKANHALLI

Presented by Mukri Bahadur Note 79/10/33 Stamped

The Petitioners abovenamed most humbly and respectfully pray that the order of the Government in Muzrai Appeal No 27 of 29-30, communicated to them by endorsement dated 18/9/33 and produced herewith, may be reviewed and relief granted to the petitioners suitable to

the facts of the Case

Certain lands in Kankanhalli Taluk were given to the Sri Degila Mutt of Kankanhalli The ryots who were cultivating the lands with occupancy

occupancy rights therein and who were till then paying Rajapalu to Government began thereafter to pay the Rajapalu to the Mutt The petitioners are the - successors in title of these ryots They are permanent holders of the lands not as lessees from the Mutt but as occupancy ryots whose rights existed from a time long anterior to the creation of the Inam itself The grant of the Inam conveyed to the Mutt the Rajapalu which was till then being paid to the Government

Latterly on the erroneous assumption that the petitioners were alienees from the Mutt, proceedings were instituted for resumption of the lands The order of the Government also proceeds on this basis which petitioners most respectfully submit is an error apparent on the face of the record

Even in so doing the order does not - comply with and is directly opposed to the principles laid down in the matter by Government Notification No 126 dated 17th November 1877 (published in Pages 70-71-72 of the - Madurai Manual) According to the Notification all alienations prior to 1817 have to be confirmed to the alienees and those between 1817 and 1853 should be confirmed subject to payment of half the assessment to the Mutt This aspect of the case has altogether been ignored in the order

Perhaps mistake for 66. (Half of the memorandum)

The petitioners are the successors in title

of

18

of the holders of the land long prior to 1817 Even if such holders were to be deemed alienees from the Mutt the alienations in favour of the petitioners and their - predecessors in title being long before 1817, the lands have to be confirmed to the - - petitioners on the same terms on which they have been holding for over a hundred and sixteen years

Even otherwise, since none of the - petitioners is an alinee subsequent to 1853, the lands have to be confirmed to the - petitioners on their paying half the assessment to the Mutt in accordance with the notification

The petitioners most respectfully submit that the order sought to be reviewed has - ignored all these aspects of the law and is based on assumptions not borne out by the - record The petitioners are subjected to grave injustice and loss of substantial rights by the order

In the interests of justice it is therefore highly necessary that the petitioners' rights should be considered and relief granted in accordance with law, on the following -

Grounds of Review

1 That the order is based on the - assumption that petitioners are alienees from the Mutt which they are not as is clear from their documents of title The petitioners,

even

even as their predecessors in title were, are occupancy ryots who were originally paying rajapalu to Government and have been subsequent to the grant of Inam to the Mutt, paying the Rajapalu to the Mutt Their occupancy rights are not derived from the Mutt and are independant of the Mutt and the grant of the Inam thereto The assumption that petitioners are tenants of and lessees from the Mutt is an error and - vitiates the order in toto

2 That even assuming petitioners to be alienees, the lands in their possession could not be resumed or otherwise dealt with except in accordance with the notification of the 17th November 1877, and the order in question has totally ignored this aspect of the case

3 That since petitioners and their predecessors in title have been in possession from a time long prior to 1817 the lands have to be confirmed to petitioners on the terms on which they are holding and cannot be - resumed The order in question has overlooked this aspect and leads to a miscarriage of - justice

4 That in any case, it being admitted that petitioners have been in possession from a time anterior to 1853, the lands should have been confirmed to them and they be directed to pay half the assessment to the Mutt (vide Muzrai Mannual Pages 70 and 71) The order

in

in question is ex facie erroneous and results in grave injustice

5 That the order is inconsistent in that it treats the petitioners once as tenants-at-will and again as permanent & tenants If it is the former there is no alienation at all so as to invite interference by Government and the order would be illegal If it is the latter, the notification has been ignored and the order would again be opposed to law As a matter of fact petitioners are not tenants at all of the Mutt anymore than an occupancy ryot paying kandayam is a tenant under Government

6 That the order in question is thus opposed to law and results in grave misearriage of justice

7 That the order was passed without hearing the petitioners who as appellants had been notified and had appeared but were not heard

8 That the order deprives the petitioners of their lawful rights without giving them an opportunity to protect the same by placing facts and circumstances before this Hon'ble Government

The Petitioners, therefore, most humbly and respectfully pray that the order in question may kindly be reviewed and set aside

In view of the foregoing circumstances,

and

and the just grievance of the petitioners, it is humbly prayed that the order in - question may be stayed pending final orders on this petition

The Petitioners further most respectfully pray that they may be heard in support of - their case before final orders are passed in the matter

BANGALORE, 19 10 33

K T Bhashyam Ayangar
ADVOCATE FOR PETITIONERS

Schedule

Petitioner	Survey Number	Date of Document
1 Honge Gowda	277	1850
2 Mallari Rao	278	1829
3 Venkatappa	246	
	248	1806
4 Venkatramaiya	249	
5 Venkatramane Gowda	246	
	248	1806
	249	
	237	1838
		1846

BANGALORE,
19 10 33

K T Bhashyam Iyengar

ADVOCATE FOR PETITIONERS

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS 23

THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE$

***** O:*****

Muzrai Appeal No 27 of 1929-30

Appellants:-

(1) Yeeraiya, Honge Gowda and others

(2) Bandi Mallaiya of Kankarhalli

Vs

Respondent -

Sri Nirvanaswami of Sri Degila Mutt, Kankanhalli

Subject - Appeal against the orders of the Muzrai Commis-
-sioner in Appeal No 6 of 1928-29 on the file of his Court directing that the lease of the lands of the Sri Degila Mutt, Kankanhalli, be continued to the present lessees for a fairly long period if they are agreeable to pay a reason-
-able rent to the Mutt

The dispute is about the Devadava Inam lands of the Sri Degila Mutt, Kankanhalli The appellants state that they hold leases in respect of these lands, but contend that they should be considered as permanent lessees It has been ascertained that they have been paying to the Mutt, according to the terms of the leases, the Rajapal due to it in the form of either produce or its value The Rajapal paid to a land-lord is, from its nature, a fluctuat-
-ing amount and it is the annual gutta payable by a tenant-at-will The permanent lease of a land should be viewed as its alienation and the Head of a Mutt has no authority to alienate a land endowed to it and any alienation by him, unless it is made with the previous sanction of Government, should be considered as null and void It is not stated that there is the sanction of Government in support of the

the permanent leases claimed by the appellants. In their representation, the appellants suggest that a reasonable rent might be taken from them by the Mutt, but that the lands might be allowed to be in their possession as a permanent measure. According to this arrangement proposed by the appellants themselves, the rent payable by them has to be altered as the conditions affecting it vary from time to time The procedure suggested is the same as that followed in the case of tenants-at-will. In view of the inalienable nature of Devadaya lands and of the fact that the Head of a Mutt is not competent to create any interest in respect of the property of his Mutt to enure beyond his life, the relation between the appellants and the Mutt has throughout been that between tenants-at-will and land-lord and there can be no adverse possession by the former against the latter. The appellants represent that they have incurred considerable expenditure in converting the dry into garden lands and that it would not be fair to deprive them of the lands altogether Some consideration might be shown to them for having improved the income yielding character of the lands, but it should not be overlooked that they have kept the bulk of the benefit to themselves and that for very long periods - and have not allowed the mutt to share in it. The most equitable disposal of the case would be to allow the appellants to have, in the first instance, fairly long leases of these lands on fair rents which can be considered fair in view of all the factors to be taken into account and this is what the Muzrai Commissioner has directed in his order dated the 14th September 1929. There are, in these circumstances, no reasons to interfere with this order and the appeal is dismissed



2k

Before the Government of H H the Maharaja of Mysore ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು

Mys Rev Petn 1933–1934 ನೇ ನಂಬರು

ವ ದಿ ಯಾ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ್ ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ ಯಾ ಆಪ್ಪೊನೆಂಟ

Honge Gowda & others } Vs { Sri Narasaswamiah & Sri Gopala Rutt

ಮುll ರಾll ಕ ಟಿ ಭಾಷ್ಯಂಆಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ, ಬಿ ಎ ಬಿ ಎಲ್ ಮತ್ತು
ಎಂ ಶ್ರೀಪಾದ್ರಿ ಬಿ ಎ ಎಲ್ ಬಿ ಅಡ್ವೊಕೇಟ್ಸ್‌ರವರಿಗೆ
N K Subbaraya Shastry
Petitioners ಬರಸಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್ ನಾಮಾ

ಈ ಮೊಖದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ವಕ್ಕೀರುವರಿಗೂ ಕೊರ್ಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವಾದ ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಆಗುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಧವಾದ ಆರ್ಡರ್‌ನ್ನೂ ಡಿಕ್ರಿಯನ್ನೂ ಜಾರೀಕ್ರಮ ನಡೆಸಿ ಹಣ ವಸೂಲುಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ನನಗೆ ಕೊರ್ಟ್‌ನಿಂದ ಸಲ್ಲಬೆಕಾಗಿರುವ ಡಿಕ್ರಿ ಮೊಬಲಗು ಶಿಲ್ಕು ಮೊಬಲಗು ಪ್ರೋಸೆಸ್ ಸ್ವಾಂಪು ದಾವಾಸ್ವಾಂವು ಸಹ ಪಡೆಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ದಸ್ತೈವಜು ವಗೈರಗಳನ್ನು ವಾಪಸು ಪಡೆಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ಕೇಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಜಿ ವಗೈರ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ಮೊಖದ್ದಮೆಯನ್ನು ವಾಪಸ್ ಪಡೆಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ಸಹ ತಮಗೆ ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಧೆ ನೆ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ತ ವ ಗಲಿ ಯಾ ತಮಗೊ ಸ್ಕರ ಮತ್ಯಾವ ಲಾಯರ್‌ಗಲಿ ಡಿಟೋ ಮೊಖದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಯಿ ಸವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನೂ ನಾನು ಖುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದು ನಡೆಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಬದ್ಧನಾಗಿ ಇರ ತ್ತೆ ನೆ

ತಾರಿ ಖು 4 T mark of Honge Gowda ರುಜು

Subbaramaiah
Narasimhaiah
Venkatappa

ಈ ಮೊಕ್ತೇಕರುನಾಮಾ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನ ಗೆ ಪರಿ ಚಯಸ್ತರಾಗಿ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ರುಜು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ

ಅಡ್ವೊಕೆ ಟ್ಸ

ಈ ಮೊಕ್ತೇಕರುನಾಮಾ ಆಗಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಇಧೀನೆ ರವರಿಸಿದೆ

K Subbaraya Shastry
ಅಡ್ವೋಕೇಟ್ಸ್ for Petitioners

ಯಜರ್ಮ ಅ ಡ ಸನ್ಸ್, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿ



GENL & REV
430
21 OCT 1933
MYSORE

2313 (27)

19/10

Mcy 335-33-2

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE -

MAHARAJA OF MYSORE - BANGALORE.

Muzrai Review Petition No 9 of 1933-34

PETITIONER -	--(VS)--	OPPONENT -
Bandi Mallayya, Son of Bandi - Chennappa, Resides in Kanakanahalli.		Sri: Nirvana Swami - of Sri Degala Mutt, Kanakanahalli

Presented by the advocate

Sgd 19/10

Stay order asked for

The petitioner above-named most humbly and respectfully prays that for the - - reasons set out below - the Government be graciously pleased to review their order passed in Muzrai - Appeal No 27 of 1929 - 30 and confirm the title of the petitioner to the lands in dispute.

Sgd 19/10

1. The petitioner is the absolute owner of S Nos 274, 275 and one acre and 12¼ guntas in S No 251 and 21¼ guntas in S No 252 of Kanakana-Halli Though these lands are now claimed by ~~Sri~~ Sri Degala Mutt of Kanakanahalli they were in the holding of independent owners long prior to their being granted as Inam to the Mutt. and the alienation of the first two numbers date back to a period more than 50 years prior to 31st January 1853, and the other numbers were alienated a few years later, and

Sgd 19/10

Sgd 19/10

ever

ever since then - the said alienees and their successors in title have been in peaceful and undisturbed possession of these lands in their own right exercising all acts of owner-ship recognised in law

2. That long before 1829, the owner of S Nos - 274 and 275 was one Gavi Dasana Betta - who sold these - lands to one Mariappa, who on 17/2/1829, transferred these lands by a deed of exchange to one Pamarri Naganna with full rights of ownership Even then, these lands had been - - converted into Co-coanut gardens yielding fruit and therefor the original transfer must have been long prior to 1800, several years before they were granted as Inam to the - - - opponent's mutt

3. That since then the said Naganna and his - descendants - Sanjeevasetty - Ramasetty and Krishnasetty, were in possession and enjoyment of these gardens, exercising all acts of ownership - and on 18/11/1901, Ramasetty's wife Lakshamma - and her adopted son Ramasetty - and - - Krishnasetty's son Venkatappa - mortgaged these lands to one Malle Gowda for a valuable consideration of Rs.1500/- to discharge a prior encumbrance created by them in favour of one Appannappa under a deed dated 24/4/1890, and - - - subsequently the said Ramasetty and Krishna Setty effected two hypothecations of these lands in favour of the said Mallegowda under deeds dated 15/1/1906 and 12/5/1906 - - - respectively with a view to discharge these various debts -

the said Ramasetty and Krishnasetty subsequently sold these lands to the petitioner for a valid consideration of Rs 2650-0-0 under a duly registered sale deed dated - 8/1/1909.

4 That from the recitals in the said sale deed and the other documents it is manifest that the petitioner and his predecessors in title were the absolute owners of these lands subject to the payment of assessment to - - Government and cash rent at a fixed rate to the Swamies of the opponent's Mutt after they were granted as Inam to the Mutt and the successive Swamies also have recognised these rights of ownership and have accepted the rent They - are therefore now estopped in law from setting up any - superior rights to these lands other than their right to receive rent at a fixed rate

5 That so far as the portion in S No 251 is - concerned a portion of land measuring 37 guntas in extent was originally owned by one Kapinappa - who sold it to - one Bylappa alias Appannappa under a sale deed dated - - 4/12/1903, and after the death of the latter his wife and legal representative, sold this land to the petitioner - under a duly registered sale deed dated 18/11/1906 The other 15½ guntas in this number originally belonged to two brothers Bale Veerabhadrappa and Mahantappa, who sold it to one Sanjeevasetty on 23/9/1873 and after Sanjeevasetty's death his brother Krishnasetty sold this land to one - -

Chinna Venkatamma

Chinna Venkatamma on 25/4/1879, who in turn sold it to one Imam sab under a sale deed dated 3/1/1894 - The said Iman Sab and his son Gousekhan Sab, mortgaged this land and 21½ guntas in S No 252 to one Kadasetty under a mortgage deed dated 14/7/1910, and to discharge this mortgage debt - the said Iman Sab and his son sold these two lands to the petitioner under a duly registered sale deed dated 29/12/1912 Even these lands were being enjoyed by the petitioner and his predecessors in title, as absolute owners, subject to the liability of paying - rent in kind at a fixed rate of 50 percent - called - - Rajwar, and though the quantum of produce might have - varied according to the yield of the lands, the rate at which the payment of rent had been fixed namely 50 percent of the produce grown, never changed And as the law now recognises - it is not the acutal quantity of produce ~~that~~ but the rate that determines the nature of the tenancy and when once it is found that the rate never varied - the - - tenancy is deemed to be a permanent one This has been accepted and recognised by the successive swamies.

6 That further it is apparent from the fact that these lands had been leased out for Co-coanut and Arecanut gardens, that the intention of the lessors was to lease - these lands an permanent tenures, as otherwise no tenant - would be willing to enter into a lease to plant Co-coanut and Aracanut gardens on these lands, if the tenancy was a precarious

precarious one and if he was liable to be evicted from these lands - even before he had the chance to realise the fruits of his labour - and he would not have any - incentive to rear these trees for a period of at least 10 to 15 years ~~xxxx~~ till they begin to yield fruit, for absolutely no return whatsoever for all his labour and cost - and go on paying rent to the land lord - for no return whatsoever.

7 These fundamental facts were not brought to the notice of he Government when they decided the appeal and the petitioner had no opportunity to do so, as he was not given a hearing at all and the appeal was decided by the Government only on the records But even then, the Government had no opportunity to inspect the various title deeds referred to above as they were in the custody of - the petitioner, and the petitioner had referred to them in his appeal memo and had undertaken to produce them for - the inspection of the Government at the time of the hearing of the appeal These documents would have conclusively - established the petitioner's absolute title to these lands.

8. But the Learned Sub Division Officer of Clospet who was directed by the Deputy Commissioner to hold a detailed enquiry into this matter and to submit a report - inspected these title deeds - and was satisfied about the absolute - rights of the petitioner and the holders of other lands, - and submitted a report on 26/3/1928, holding that since - -

most

most of the alienations were prior to 1853, the rights of the ryots could not be interfered with The Learned Deputy Commissioner also concurred with the findings of the Sub-Division Officer But the Learned Muzrai - - Commissioner [illegible] though he has not differed from the - - findings of he Sub Division officer - that the alienations were prior to 1853, has expressed an opinion on the erroneous assumption that the alienations prior to 1853 were only by way of mortgage - and as such the alienations were not permanent But there were no mortgages created by any - of the Swamies, and as such he opinion expressed by the Learned Muzrai Commissioner cannot be supported in law - The mortgages referred to were between the alienees - - interse and as such these cannot in any way alter t h e character of the original alienations Therefore the - order of the Learned Muzrai Commissioner - casting a cloud on the title of the petitioner, and suggesting a fresh - lease of these lands to the petitioner for a fairly long - period at an enhanced rate of rent - is tantamount to a - denial of the prescriptive title which the petitioner has acquired for these lands

9. That in confirming this order of the Learned - Muzrai Commissioner, the Government have been pleased to - observe - that as the lessees have been paying Rajapal to the Mutt in the form of either produce or its value and as

the

the Rajapal paid to a land lord is, from its nature, a fluctuating amount, that it was an annual gutta payable by a tenant at will and as the alienations were made - without the sanction of the Government they were to be treated as null and void and that throughout, the relation between the petitioner and other holders - has been that between tenants at will and land lord - and that there - could be no adverse possession by the former against the latter

10. But it is respectfully submitted that as set out in para 5 supra - it is not the quantity of produce - given by the tenant to the land lord that determines the nature of the tenancy It is the rate that determines it. The quantity might vary according to the yield, but if the rate or proportion at which the payment to be made is fixed as in the case of Rajapal at 50 per cent, whatever may be th yield - then the tenancy is deemed to be permanent. And further it is a recognised principle of law that even as - between land lord and the tenant adverse possession can be successfully pleaded when the land lord seeks to exercise any right or make any claim which is inconsistent with the terms of the tenancy That as regards the observations - of the Government that the alienations should be considered as null and void as they were made without the sanction o the Government, it is respectfully submitted that in so fa as the Government have not differed from the finding of th

Sub Divisi

Sub Division officer that the alienations were - - anterior to 1853, the said alienations cannot be treated as null and viod in the light of the Chief Commissioners Notification No 266 dated 17/11/1877, and the lands ought to have been confirmed to the Petitioner and other holders - on the terms prescribed in the Land Revenue Rules, and should not be treated as Devadaya Inam Lands

11 The petitioner, to the best of his recollection, has no where in his memorandum of appeal, made any representation that a reasonable rent might be taken from him and - that he should be treated as a tenant at will All along his prayer has been that his title to these lands as absolute owner be recognised If however, there is anything in his appeal petition, which can be intrepreted in that way, it - was not intended, and the petitioner regrets the error If the petitioner had been granted a hearing in his appeal - he would have had an opportunity to urge his claim and satisfy the Government about the bonafides of his rights

12. The petitioner did not get any notice of the - hearing of his appeal - and he did not even know that his - appeal had been disposed of It was only on 29/9/1933, when a notice from the Closepet Sub-Division Officer was served on him calling upon him to execute a Muchalika within 10 days, - that he would pay cash rent at the rate of Rs.30/- per acre - per year for a period of ten years - that the petitioner for the first time learnt that his appeal had been disposed of.

13 Soon after

13. Soon after he went to his Advocate, to - ascertain what had happened to his appeal - but his - Advocate also informed him that he did not get any notice of the hearing of the appeal nor even that the appeal had been disposed of It was only after the petitioner - obtained the Copy of the Government order on 13/10/1933 that he came to know of the disposal of this appeal.

14 The petitioner is fully confident that if the Government had inspected his title deeds and other documents, their decesion would not have been the same. He submits here with copies of the relevent documents - he will produce the originals at the time of hearing.

He therefore most humbly and respectfully prays that the Government be graciously pleased to grant a hearing to the petitioner and an opportunity to him to place before the Government all his title deeds - receipts and other documents which conclusively establish his claim to these lands - and be pleased to review their order - passed in appeal No 27 of 1929-30, and confirm the title of the petitioner to these lands

That in so far as the Deputy Commissioner of Bangalore - without any enquiry as regards the quality of the different lands - and their yielding capacity and without notice to the petitioner has arbitrarily fixed a uniform - rent of Rs.30/- per acre per year and has directed a - - -

Muchalika

36

Muchalika to be taken from the petitioner and as the - Sub Division Officer - has been threatening to resume the lands - if the Muchalika is not executed within - 10 days of his Notice, and as under the aforesaid circumstances the petitioner will be seriously prejudiced if his lands are resumed, he further humbly prays that pending the disposal of his application before the Government - a stay order might kindly be granted directing the Deputy Commissioner and the Sub Division Officer - to keep the - order of resumption in abeyance

J T Narasa
Bandi Mallayya

BANGALORE,
19th October 1933

PETITIONER





Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore

Muzrai Appeal No 27 of 1929-30

Appellants -

1 Yeeraiya Honge Gowda and others

2 Bandi Mallaiya of Kankanhalli

Vs

Respondent -

Sri Nirvana Swami of Sri Degila Mutt Kankanhalli

Subject

Appeal against the orders of the Muzrai Commissioner in Appeal No 6 of 1928-29 on the file of his Court directing -- that the lease of the lands of the Sri Degila Mutt, Kankanhalli be continued to the present lessees for a fairly long period if they are agreeable to pay a reasonable rent to the Mutt

---

The dispute is about the Devadaya Inam lands of the Sri Degila Mutt, Kankanhalli The appellants state that they hold leases in respect of these lands, but contend that they should be considered as permanent lessees It has been ascertained that they have been paying to the Mutt, according to the terms of the leases, the Rajapal due to it in the form of either produce or its value The Rajapal paid to a

38

land-lord is, from its nature, a fluctuating amount and it is the annual gutta payable by a tenant-at-will The permanent lease of a land should be viewed as its alienation and the Head of a Mutt has no authority to alienate a land endowed to it and any alienation by him, unless it is made with the previous sanction of Government, should be considered as null and void It is not stated that there is the sanction of Government in support of the permanent leases claimed by the appellants In their representation, the appellants suggest that a reasonable rent might be taken from them by the Mutt, but that the lands might be allowed to be in their possession as a permanent measure According to this arrangement proposed by the appellants themselves, the rent payable by them has to be altered as the conditions affecting it vary from time to time The procedure suggested is the same as that followed in the case of tenants-at-will In view of the inalienable nature of Devadaya lands and of the fact that the Head of a Mutt is not competent to create any interest in respect of the property of his Mutt to ensure beyond his life, the relation between the appellants and the Mutt has throughout been that between tenants-at-will and land-lord and there can be no adverse possession by the former against the latter The appellants represent that they have incurred considerable expenditure in converting the dry into garden lands and that it would not be fair to deprive them of the lands altogether Some consideration might be shown to them for having improved the income-yielding character of the lands, but it should not be overlooked that they have kept the bulk of the benefit to themselves - and that for very long periods - and have not

39

allowed the Mutt to share in it The most equitable disposal of the case would be to allow the appellants to have, in the first instance, fairly long leases of these lands on gutta amourts which can be considered fair in view of all the factors to be taken into account and this is what the Muzrai'Commissioner has directed in his order dated 14th September 1929 There are, in these circumstances, no reasons to interfere with this order and the appeal is dismissed



& Copy"

Copy applied for on 7 10 33

Number of words 552

Copying and Comparing Charges — 0-14-0

KN Krishnaswamy Ayr for Secretary to Govt Financial Depts

Compared by G S

Copy ready on 13 10 33.



40

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore
Bangalore
Misc Rev Petn No 1933 34

193 —3 ನೇ ನಂಬರು ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ

ವಾದಿ ಯೂ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ್ Petitioner		ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ ಯೂ ಆಪೋನೆಂಟ್ Opponent
Banki Mallappa	Vs	1 Sri Narayanaswamy 2 Sri Deveeramma

ಮಾ|| ರಾ|| ಕೆ ಯರ್ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸ್, ಎಂ ಎ ಎಲ್‌ಎಲ ಬಿ ಅಡ್ವೊಕೇಟ್
ಮಾ|| ರಾ|| ಆರ್ ಪಿ ವಾಸುದೇವ್, ಬಿ ಎ ಬಿ ಎಲ್ ಅಡ್ವೊಕೇಟ್
ಮಾ|| ರಾ|| ಟಿ ನರಸಿಂಹ್ಮ ಅಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್, ಬಿ ಎ ಬಿ ಎಲ್
ಮಾ|| ರಾ|| ಬಿ ಬಂಡಪ್ಪ, ಬಿ ಎ ಬಿ ಎಲ್

ರವರಿಗೆ Petitioner ಬರೆಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್ ನಾಮಾ

ಈ ಮೊಖದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ತಮ್ಮೈರುವರಿವಿಗೂ ಕೋರ್ಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವಾದ ಜರುಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ನನ್ನಪರ ಆಗುವ ಎಲ್ಲ ವಿಧವಾದ ಲರ್ಜಿರನ್ನೂ ಡಿಕ್ರಿಯನ್ನೂ ಜಾರಿಕ್ರಮನಡಿಸಿ ಹಣ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವದಕ್ಕೂ ರ ಜವಗೈರೆ ಪೈಸಲ್ಮಾಡಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಒಗ್ಯೂ ನನಗೆ ಕೊರ್ಟ್‌ನಿಂದ ಸ್ವೀಕಾರಿಕಾಗಿರುವ ಡಿಕ್ರಿ ಮೊಬಲಗೂ ಶಿಲ್ಕು ಮೊಬಲಗೂ ರಿ ಫಂಡು ಸ್ಟಾಂಪು ಮೊಬಲಗೂ ದಸ್ತೈವಜು ವಗೈರೆಗಳನ್ನು ವಾಪಸು ಪಡೆಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ಸಹ ತಮಗೆ ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ತಾವಾಗಲಿ ಯಾ ತಮಗೊ ಸ್ಕರ ಮತ್ಯಾವ ಲಾಯಿಂರಾಗಲಿ ಡಿಟೋ ಮೊಖದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡಿಸ ವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಖುದ್ದು ನಡಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಬದ್ಧನಾಗಿ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ

L T mark of Banki Mallappa

ಈ ಮೊಕ್ತಾರುನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯ ಸ್ತ ರಾಗಿ ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ರ ಜು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ
KNS

ಈ ಮೊಕ್ತಾರುನಾಮೆ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ ಇದ್ದೇವೆ

K N Sanjivarao

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು
19 10 —1933

ಅಡ್ವೋಕೇಟ್ಸ್

(41)

'True copy'

Sample Value
n - a - p

ನಂಬಲಸಕ್ಯವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಸಿಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಕಾರಣವೇನೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ
ಕಳೆದ ಜೂನ್ ತಿಂಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಕೆಲವು ಕೆಲಸದ ನಿಮಿತ್ತ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿಗೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾಗ
ಅವರನ್ನು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಜೊತೆ ನೋಡಿದ್ದೆನೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೆನು ಅಷ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರು ನಿಮ್ಮ
ಮೇಲೆ ಯಾವ ಸಂಶಯವನ್ನು ತಾಳಿದ್ದರೋ ನಾನರಿಯೆ ಅವರು ಬಹಳ ಸಂಕಟ
ಪಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅವರ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಸಮಾಧಾನವಾಗುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಅವರ ಸಂಶಯವನ್ನು
ಪರಿಹರಿಸಿ ಅವರ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಶಾಂತಿಯನ್ನುಂಟುಮಾಡಿ ಅವರ ಜೀವವನ್ನು ಉಳಿಸಿ
ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಅವರು ಬಹಳ ಸಾಧುಸ್ವಭಾವದವರು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಯಾವ
ಕಾರಣದಿಂದಲೂ ಸಂಶಯ ಪಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಅವರು
ಬೇಗನೆ ಬರಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಆಶೆಯಿಂದ ಕಾಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಈ ಸಮಾಚಾರವನ್ನು
ತಿಳಿಸಿ ಅವರ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಸಮಾಧಾನವನ್ನುಂಟುಮಾಡಿ ಅವರನ್ನು ಬೇಗನೆ
ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಈ ಸಮಾಚಾರವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಿದ
ಮೇಲೆ ಅವರು ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವ ಅಡ್ಡಿಯೂ ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾನು ನಂಬಿದ್ದೇನೆ
ಅವರು ಬರುವ ದಿವಸವನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ತಿಳಿಸಿದರೆ ಸಾಕು ಅವರನ್ನು ಕರೆದುಕೊಂಡು
ಹೋಗಲು ಸ್ಟೇಷನ್ನಿಗೆ ಬರುವೆನು ಅವರು ಬರುವ ದಿವಸ ಮಾತ್ರ ತಿಳಿಸಿದರೆ
ಸಾಕು ಅವರು ಬರುವ ಸಮಾಚಾರವನ್ನು ಬೇರೆ ಯಾರಿಗೂ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ
ಅವರು ಬರುವ ಸಮಾಚಾರವನ್ನು ಬೇರೆ ಯಾರಿಗೂ ತಿಳಿಸಬಾರದೆಂದು
ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹೇಳಿಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ ಅವರು ಬರುವ ಸಮಾಚಾರವನ್ನು ಬೇರೆ ಯಾರಿಗೂ
ತಿಳಿಸಬಾರದೆಂದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹೇಳಿಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ ಅವರು ಬರುವ ಸಮಾಚಾರವನ್ನು
ಬೇರೆ ಯಾರಿಗೂ ತಿಳಿಸಬಾರದೆಂದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹೇಳಿಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ ಅವರು
ಬರುವ ಸಮಾಚಾರವನ್ನು ಬೇರೆ ಯಾರಿಗೂ ತಿಳಿಸಬಾರದೆಂದು ಅವರಿಗೆ
ಹೇಳಿಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ ಅವರು ಬರುವ ಸಮಾಚಾರವನ್ನು ಬೇರೆ ಯಾರಿಗೂ
ತಿಳಿಸಬಾರದೆಂದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹೇಳಿಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ ಅವರು ಬರುವ

(Sd) ಸಬ್ ಇನ್ಸ್‌ಪೆಕ್ಟರ್ ಆಫ್ ಪೋಲೀಸ್
ಕಾಮನ ಕೆರೆ ಸರ್ಕಲ್ ಕಾಮನ ಕೆರೆ

ಜಾಬ್ತಿಗೆ—

ಶಂಕರಯ್ಯನವರವರಾದ ಬಿ ಶಂಕರಯ್ಯನವರವರಿಗೆ
ಅಬ್ಬಿಗೆ ಸಾಮವರ್ ಜಾಬ್ತಿ

ಕಾಮನ ಕೆರೆ ಸರ್ಕಲ್

ನಂ 2724-2725

ಈ ಸಂಗತಿಯನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಿದೆ ಕಾಮನ ಕೆರೆ ಸರ್ಕಲ್ ಇನ್ಸ್‌ಪೆಕ್ಟರ್ ಆಫೀಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ

49

I

[illegible] 83 [illegible] 202 [illegible]
209 [illegible] 555 [illegible]
[illegible]

ತಾ. 9 1- 1909

(Sd) Sreenivasa Iyengar
Sub Registrar

[illegible]

ಸಂ. 1886 ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಕಾರಣಗಳಿಂದ 1 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾರಣಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸೂಚಿಸಿದೆ.

"True copy"

"True copy"

"True copy"

Sd/-
Advocate for K. M. Vasudeva Upadhya, Kasaragod

ಸಾಕ್ಷಿ ನಂ-೧ ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಾರ್ಜುನಪ್ಪ ಸಾ|| ಕಾಡಜ್ಜಿ ಇವರು ಪ್ರಮಾಣ ಮಾಡಿ ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದು ಅದರ ಸಾರಾಂಶವೆನೆಂದರೆ ನಾನು ಕಾಡಜ್ಜಿ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಸಾಹುಕಾರಿಕೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈ ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮಾರು ೨೦ ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಇ

ಆರೋಪಿಯ ಪರ ವಕೀಲರು — ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್.ಕೆ.ಪಾಟೀಲ

ಅಪರಾಧ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಮತ್ತು ಕಲಂಗಳು — ಧಾರವಾಡ ಗ್ರಾಮಾಂತರ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆ ಅಪರಾಧ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 76/2003 ಕಲಂ 143, 147, 148, 323, 324, 307 ಸಹ ಕಲಂ 149 ಐ.ಪಿ.ಸಿ.

ತೀರ್ಪು ಕಾಯ್ದಿರಿಸಿದ ದಿನಾಂಕ — 12/03/2003

ತೀರ್ಪು ಪ್ರಕಟಿಸಿದ ದಿನಾಂಕ — 20/03/2003

ಜಿಲ್ಲಾ ಸರಕಾರಿ ವಕೀಲರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್.ಎಸ್.ಹಿರೇಮಠ ಅವರಿಂದ ಸರಕಾರದ ಪರವಾಗಿ ವಾದ ಮಂಡನೆ

ಆರೋಪಿಯ ಪರ ವಕೀಲರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್.ಕೆ.ಪಾಟೀಲ ಅವರಿಂದ ವಾದ ಮಂಡನೆ

ಸಾಕ್ಷಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಯ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಜರಿದ್ದ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಗಳು — ಪಿ.ಡಬ್ಲ್ಯು.1 ರಿಂದ ಪಿ.ಡಬ್ಲ್ಯು.5

ಸಾಕ್ಷಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಯ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಜರಿದ್ದ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಗಳು — ಡಿ.ಡಬ್ಲ್ಯು.1 ರಿಂದ ಡಿ.ಡಬ್ಲ್ಯು.3

ಸಾಕ್ಷಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಯ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಜರಿದ್ದ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯದ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಗಳು — ಸಿ.ಡಬ್ಲ್ಯು.1 ರಿಂದ ಸಿ.ಡಬ್ಲ್ಯು.2

ಸಾಕ್ಷಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಯ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಜರಿದ್ದ ಪಂಚರು — ಪಂಚನಾಮೆ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಗಳು ಪಿ.ಡಬ್ಲ್ಯು.3 ಮತ್ತು ಪಿ.ಡಬ್ಲ್ಯು.4

ಸಾಕ್ಷಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಯ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಜರಿದ್ದ ತನಿಖಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು — ಪಿ.ಡಬ್ಲ್ಯು.5 ಪಿ.ಎಸ್.ಐ. ಧಾರವಾಡ ಗ್ರಾಮಾಂತರ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆ

ಸಾಕ್ಷಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಯ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಜರಿದ್ದ ಇತರೆ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಗಳು — ಡಿ.ಡಬ್ಲ್ಯು.1 ಡಾ. ಎಸ್.ಎಂ.ಪಾಟೀಲ, ಡಿ.ಡಬ್ಲ್ಯು.2 ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್.ಕೆ.ಜೋಶಿ, ಡಿ.ಡಬ್ಲ್ಯು.3 ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ.ಎಸ್.ಕುಲಕರ್ಣಿ

ಸಾಕ್ಷಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಯ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಜರಿದ್ದ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಗಳು — ಸಿ.ಡಬ್ಲ್ಯು.1 ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ.ಜಿ.ಹೆಗಡೆ, ಸಿ.ಡಬ್ಲ್ಯು.2 ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ.ಆರ್.ಭಟ್

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಕಾಸಂ/ಕಾಪ್ರ/ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆ/೨೦೨೫-೨೬/೧೪೭೩೬ ದಿನಾಂಕ: ೨೭-೦೮-೨೦೨೫

ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆ

ಕಾಸಂ ಕಾಪ್ರ ಕಲಂ ೧೪೪ ಮತ್ತು ೧೪೪(೨) ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊರಡಿಸಿದ್ದ ಆದೇಶಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರಿಗೆ ಮಾಹಿತಿ ನೀಡುವ ಕುರಿತು

ಕಾಸಂ ಕಾಪ್ರ ಕಲಂ ೧೪೪ ಮತ್ತು ೧೪೪(೨) ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊರಡಿಸಿದ್ದ ಆದೇಶಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರಿಗೆ ಮಾಹಿತಿ ನೀಡುವ ಕುರಿತು

[illegible]

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಎಸಿಎಂ/ಸಿಆರ್/ಎಸ್‌ಆರ್/ಎಸ್‌ಆರ್-೧೦೭೩/೨೦೧೮-೧೯, ದಿನಾಂಕ: ೧೭.೦೬.೨೦೧೯

ಸೇವಾನಿರತರು

ಇವರಿಗೆ

ಮಾನ್ಯರೇ,

ವಿಷಯ: ಸಿಆರ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಸಭೆ ಕುರಿತು.

ಉಲ್ಲೇಖ: ಸಿಆರ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಸಭೆ ಕುರಿತು ಈ ಕಚೇರಿಯ ಪತ್ರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಎಸಿಎಂ/ಸಿಆರ್/ಎಸ್‌ಆರ್/ಎಸ್‌ಆರ್-೧೦೭೩/೨೦೧೮-೧೯, ದಿನಾಂಕ: ೧೭.೦೬.೨೦೧೯

ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ವಿಷಯ ಮತ್ತು ಉಲ್ಲೇಖಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಸಿಆರ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ದಿನಾಂಕ: ೨೫.೦೬.೨೦೧೯ ರಂದು ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆ ೧೦.೩೦ ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ಈ ಕಚೇರಿಯ ಸಭಾಂಗಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಏರ್ಪಡಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಸಭೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ಕಡತಗಳೊಂದಿಗೆ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿದೆ.

ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚಿಸಬೇಕಾದ ವಿಷಯಗಳು:

೧. ಸಿಆರ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಸಭೆ ಕುರಿತು ಈ ಕಚೇರಿಯ ಪತ್ರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಎಸಿಎಂ/ಸಿಆರ್/ಎಸ್‌ಆರ್/ಎಸ್‌ಆರ್-೧೦೭೩/೨೦೧೮-೧೯, ದಿನಾಂಕ: ೧೭.೦೬.೨೦೧೯ ರಲ್ಲಿ ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ವಿಷಯಗಳು.

೨. ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಬದಲಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು.

೩. ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಬದಲಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು.

೪. ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಬದಲಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು.

೫. ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಬದಲಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು.

೬. ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಬದಲಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು.

೭. ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಬದಲಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು.

೮. ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಬದಲಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು.

೯. ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಬದಲಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು.

೧೦. ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಬದಲಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು.

೧೧. ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಬದಲಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು.

೧೨. ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಬದಲಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು.

೧೩. ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಬದಲಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು.

೧೪. ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಬದಲಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು.

೧೫. ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಬದಲಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು.

೧೬. ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಬದಲಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು.

೧೭. ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಬದಲಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು.

೧೮. ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಬದಲಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು.

೧೯. ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಬದಲಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು.

೨೦. ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಬದಲಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು.

ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಬದಲಿ

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಆ ಪ್ರ ಕಾ ಪ್ರ ಸಂ ೨೦೧೨-೧೩ ಸಂಪುಟ ೧೦ ಪುಟ ೧೭೦

ಸನ್ ೧೮೭೬ನೇ ಮೇಲ್ಕಾಣಿಸಿದ ಶ್ರೀ ಕಿಂಗ್ಸ್‌ಮಿಲ್ ಸಾಹೇಬರು ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಪೂರ್ವಭಾಗದ ಕೆಲವು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರವಾಸ ಮಾಡಿ ಬಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅವರ ಸಲಹೆಯ ಮೇರೆಗೆ ಮಹಾರಾಜರವರು ಆಜ್ಞಾಪಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆಂದರೆ - ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಪೂರ್ವಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕಂದಾಯ ವಸೂಲಿಯ ಕೆಲಸವು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬ ಸಂಗತಿಯು ಮಹಾರಾಜರವರಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿದು ಬಂದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಆ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕಂದಾಯ ವಸೂಲಿಯ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯಿಸುವ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ಮಹಾರಾಜರವರು ಆಜ್ಞಾಪಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆಂದರೆ -

"True copy"

"Signed"
V Veerasamy Naidu
Sub Regr
10-3-94

"Signed"
V Veerasamy Naidu
Sub Regr
10-3-94

"True copy"

ಮೇಲಿನ ಕ್ರಯಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಇಂದು ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಸಿ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವ ಕ್ರಯದ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಪೂರ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡು ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಕ್ರಯಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಇಂದು ದಿನಾಂಕ 14-7-1910 ನೇ ಇಸವಿಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ನೋಂದಾಯಿಸಿದೆ.

'Signed' H. Srinivasamurthy
Sub Registrar

ಮೇಲಿನ ಕ್ರಯಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಇಂದು ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಸಿ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವ ಕ್ರಯದ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಪೂರ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡು ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಕ್ರಯಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಇಂದು ದಿನಾಂಕ 14-7-1910 'Signed' H. Srinivasamurthy
Sub-Registrar

ಕ್ರಯಪತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವ ಕ್ರಯದ ಹಣ ರೂ 97 ಕ್ಕೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ರೂ 48 ಅಣ 8 ಪೈಸೆಯಂತೆ ಎರಡು ಕ್ರಯಪತ್ರಗಳಿಗೆ ರೂ 97-0-0 ಆಯಿತು. ಇಂದು ದಿನಾಂಕ 14-7-1910

'Signed' H. Srinivasamurthy
Sub Registrar

ಸೀಲು

ಸರ್ಕಾರದ 1913 ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯ ಸ್ಟಾಂಪ್ ಕಾಯಿದೆಯ 31 ನೇ ಪ್ರಕರಣದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸ್ಟಾಂಪ್ ಪೇಪರ್ ಮೌಲ್ಯವನ್ನು ಕಡಿಮೆ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಕ್ರಯಪತ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ಟಾಂಪ್ ಪೇಪರ್ ಅಗತ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ.

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಕೆಎಸ್‌ಆರ್‌ಟಿಸಿ/ಸಿಆರ್‌ಎಂ/ಟೆಂಡರ್/೨೦೨೬-೨೭/೧೪೨೭ ದಿನಾಂಕ: ೧೪ ಮಾರ್ಚ್ ೨೦೨೬

ಕೆಎಸ್‌ಆರ್‌ಟಿಸಿ ಬಸ್ ನಿಲ್ದಾಣಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಪುಸ್ತಕ ಮಳಿಗೆಗಳ ಗುತ್ತಿಗೆ ನೀಡಲು ಮುಚ್ಚಿದ ಲಕೋಟೆ ಟೆಂಡರ್ ಆಹ್ವಾನ

ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯ ರಸ್ತೆ ಸಾರಿಗೆ ನಿಗಮದ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ವಿಭಾಗದ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಆಯ್ದ ಬಸ್ ನಿಲ್ದಾಣಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಪುಸ್ತಕ ಮಳಿಗೆಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಲು ಆಸಕ್ತ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಿಂದ ಮುಚ್ಚಿದ ಲಕೋಟೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಟೆಂಡರ್ ಆಹ್ವಾನಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಪ್ರಯಾಣಿಕರಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವಂತೆ ಮತ್ತು ಓದುವ ಅಭಿರುಚಿಯನ್ನು ಬೆಳೆಸುವ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಈ ಯೋಜನೆ ಜಾರಿಗೊಳಿಸಲಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ.

ಗುತ್ತಿಗೆ ಅವಧಿ ಮೂರು ವರ್ಷಗಳು. ಮಳಿಗೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕನ್ನಡ ಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳಿಗೆ ಕನಿಷ್ಠ ಶೇಕಡ ೬೦ರಷ್ಟು ಸ್ಥಳಾವಕಾಶ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಬೇಕು. ಅಶ್ಲೀಲ ಸಾಹಿತ್ಯ, ಮೂಢನಂಬಿಕೆ ಪ್ರಚೋದಿಸುವ ಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾರಾಟ ಮಾಡುವಂತಿಲ್ಲ. ಮಳಿಗೆಯ ಹೊರಗೆ ಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರದರ್ಶಿಸಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ.

ಮಾಸಿಕ ಗುತ್ತಿಗೆ ಶುಲ್ಕವನ್ನು ಪ್ರತಿ ತಿಂಗಳ ೫ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನೊಳಗೆ ಪಾವತಿಸಬೇಕು. ವಿಳಂಬವಾದರೆ ದಿನಕ್ಕೆ ೦.೫% ದಂಡ ವಿಧಿಸಲಾಗುವುದು. ಮೂರು ತಿಂಗಳ ಬಾಡಿಗೆಯಷ್ಟು ಮೊತ್ತವನ್ನು ಭದ್ರತಾ ಠೇವಣಿಯಾಗಿ ಮುಂಗಡವಾಗಿ ಪಾವತಿಸಬೇಕು. ಠೇವಣಿಯನ್ನು ಗುತ್ತಿಗೆ ಅವಧಿ ಮುಗಿದ ನಂತರ ಬಡ್ಡಿರಹಿತವಾಗಿ ಹಿಂತಿರುಗಿಸಲಾಗುವುದು.

ಟೆಂಡರ್ ದಾಖಲೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ವಿಭಾಗೀಯ ಕಚೇರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ೧೫ ಮಾರ್ಚ್ ೨೦೨೬ರಿಂದ ೨೨ ಮಾರ್ಚ್ ೨೦೨೬ರವರೆಗೆ ಕಚೇರಿ ವೇಳೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪಡೆಯಬಹುದು. ಮುಚ್ಚಿದ ಲಕೋಟೆಗಳನ್ನು ೨೩ ಮಾರ್ಚ್ ೨೦೨೬ ಮಧ್ಯಾಹ್ನ ೩ ಗಂಟೆಯವರೆಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕು. ಅಂದೇ ಸಂಜೆ ೪ ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ಟೆಂಡರ್ ತೆರೆಯಲಾಗುವುದು.

ಅಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಥವಾ ತಡವಾಗಿ ಬಂದ ಟೆಂಡರ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಗಣಿಸಲಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಯಾವುದೇ ಟೆಂಡರ್ ಅನ್ನು ಕಾರಣ ನೀಡದೆ ತಿರಸ್ಕರಿಸುವ ಹಕ್ಕು ನಿಗಮಕ್ಕಿದೆ. ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಮಾಹಿತಿಗಾಗಿ ೦೮೦-೨೨೩೪೫೬೭೮ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗೆ ಕಚೇರಿ ವೇಳೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಬಹುದು.

"True copy"

64

1913ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ಫೆಬ್ರವರಿ 3ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನ ಪೆಂಡಿಸಿಸ್ಟ್ರಾರ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಾಗಿರುವ ಕ್ರಯಪತ್ರದ ಸಾರಾಂಶವೇನೆಂದರೆ ಈ ಮುಂದೆ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಕಾಶಿ ಶೇಷಗಿರಿಯವರು ಮತ್ತು ಅವರ ಹೆಂಡತಿಯವರು ಈ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಕಂಡಿರುವ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಸ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಈ ಮುಂದೆ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಕೃಷ್ಣಮೂರ್ತಿ ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರಿಯವರಿಗೆ ಕ್ರಯಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವರು -

ಮೇಲೆ ಹೇಳಿರುವಂತೆ ಸದರಿ ಕ್ರಯವಾದ ಮುಂದಿನ ಸ್ವಾಧೀನ ಭೋಗ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅನುಭವಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಸದರಿ ಕ್ರಯಪತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಷರತ್ತುಗಳನ್ನು ಬರೆದಿರುತ್ತದೆ - ಮತ್ತು ಸದರಿ ಕ್ರಯಪತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆದಿರುವ ಷರತ್ತುಗಳಿಗೆ ಅನುಸಾರವಾಗಿ ಸದರಿ ಕ್ರಯಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಬರೆದು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವರು - ಮತ್ತು (ಪರಿಷ್ಕಾರ ಮಾಡಿರುವಂತೆ) ಸದರಿ ಕ್ರಯಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವರು -

ಸರಕಾರ ಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆಯೇ ಅಥವಾ ಸರಕಾರದವರು ಸರ್ವೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಹದ್ದುಬಸ್ತು ಕಲ್ಲುಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿರುವ ಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆಯೇ ಸದರಿ ಕ್ರಯಪತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಸ್ತಿಯ ಮೇರೆಗಳು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಇರುವಂತೆ ಸದರಿ ಕ್ರಯಪತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆದಿರುತ್ತದೆ -

ಈ ಮುಂದೆ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಕೃಷ್ಣಮೂರ್ತಿ ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರಿಯವರು ಸದರಿ ಕ್ರಯಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವರು -

ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಗಳು ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆಯೇ ಸದರಿ ಕ್ರಯಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವರು -

ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಗಳು -

ಮುಂದೆ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಗಳು ಸದರಿ ಕ್ರಯಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವರು -

ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಗಳು -

ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಕಾಶಿ ಶೇಷಗಿರಿಯವರು ಸದರಿ ಕ್ರಯಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವರ



65
2314
19/10



BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE

MAHARAJA OF MYSORE, BANGALORE

Muz Review Petn No of 33-34

Muz 335-33-3

PETITIONERS		OPPONENT.
HONGE GOWDA and others	-Vs-	SRI NIRVANASWAMIGALU OF SRI DEGILA MUTT

The Petitioners abovenamed most humbly and respectfully pray that proceedings in pursuance of the order sought to be reviewed may be stayed in view of the obvious errors and illegalities set forth in the memo of review It is also humbly submitted that whereas enforcement of the order would entail great loss and miscarriage of justice, a stay order would only maintain the status quo which has prevailed for over a hundred and odd years

BANGALORE,
19 10 33

ADVOCATE FOR PETITIONERS

66

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

FINANCIAL SECRETARIAT

Dated Bangalore 7th Novr 9th *193*3

*No.*s 623-4
Muz 335-334

From

The *Financial Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore*

To

K T Bhashyam Iyengar, Isq ,B A , B L ,
Advocate, Cottonpet, Bangalore City

K N Srinivasan, Lsq , L A ,LL B ,
Advocate, Bangalore City

Sir

Dear Sir,

With reference to petition dated the 19th October 1933 filed by you on behalf of your clerk/clients praying for a reconsideration of orders passed in Muzrai Appeal o.27/29-30, I am directed to inform you that the ~~quest~~ request for a stay order cannot be complied with.

Yours faithfully,

o/c

for FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO GOVT

vvk 3.

Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT

2755

67

Section Misc

File No 335-33

Serial No 4

Diary No of letter replied to

No 623-4

To

Mr K T Bhashyam Iyengar
& A Srs
Advocate Cotta for
Bangalore Co

(1)

(2) " K N Srinivasa M A LL B
Advocate Bangalore
Co

Dear Sir

With reference to your
letter dt 19-10-33 addressed by you
on behalf of your Clients to
Government praying for a recommendation
of orders passed in Misc
Appl No 27 of 29, 30, I
am directed to inform you
that the request for a
Stay order cannot be
complied with

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193*

Date of issue 9 11 33

Signed by Mr K M-

List of enclosures

Copied by

Examined by

WD 0253—GPB—15 000—26 8 32

Letter in Brackets
May be omitted
J Hirsch
Ed

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

FINANCIAL SECRETARIAT

69

Dated Bangalore 7th Novr. 1933

No 628/Muz 335-33-5 9Tc

From

The *Financial Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore*

To

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore

Sir

In connection with the petition praying for a review of the orders of Government passed in Muzrai Appeal No 27/29-30 filed by the appellants in the case, I am directed to request you to be so good as to submit for reference the entire records relating to lease of the lands of Sri Degila Mutt in Yankanhalli returned with this office memo No 1429/Muz 175-29-11 dated the 11th April 1933

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

for FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO GOVT

vk 2

Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT

Section Mus

File No 335- 33

Serial No 5—

Diary No of letter replied to

No 625—

To

The Mc

h

I am directed to request
that he may be good as to submit
for reference the
entire record relating to
lease of the lands of Sm
Begeta Mull lands in
Kan Kan Valley, returned
with this office memo No
14-29 dy 11 4 33
Mur 175-19-11

Thanks Etc
2 3/4
for ?

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193*

Date of issue 9 11 33

Signed by for S M

In connection
with the petition
of Mr Appeal No 29 of 1929-30
praying for a
review of the order
passed in
Mur Appeal No 27 of 1929-30,
filed by the appellants
in the case,

List of enclosures

Copied by

Examined by





BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA

OF MYSORE, BANGALORE

Muzrai Review Petition No 9 of 33-34

Petitioners.		Opponent
1 Appajappa son of Thimmaraju	VS	Sri Nirvanaswami Gurugalu of Sri Degila Mutt, Kankanhalli
2 Venkatanaranappa son of Rangappa		
3 Mallegowda son of Mallegowda		
4 Eriah son of Kalasay Setty		

all residents of kankanhalli

The petitioners abovenamed most humbly and respectfully pray that the order of the Government in Muzrai Appeal No 27 of 1929-30 may kindly be reviewed and relief granted to the petitioners suitably to the

Facts of the case

Petitioners are in the possession and enjoyment of certain lands in Kankanhalli They purchased those lands on the several dates noted in the schedule hereunder Since they have improved and developed the lands which originally fallow have now become garden lands with cocoanut trees and other fruit yielding plants The petitioners pay to the opponent Mutt the Rajapalu or Kavadaya payable to the Government since the lands have been granted as inam to the Mutt

5'68 72

Petitioners humbly submit that they are occupancy ryots of these lands and not tenants or aliences from the Mutt Neverthless on the assumption that they are aliences Government - have been pleased to direct resumption of the - lands It is respectfully submitted that it is unjust and inequitable to deprive petitioners of the lands They were not heard in the matter at all

Petitioners most humbly pray that they may be heard and the lands confirmed to them on such terms if need be as the Hon'ble Government may be pleased to impose

Bangalore,
13th November 1933

ADVOCATE FOR PETITIONERS

S C H E D U L E

No	Petitioner	Survey No	Date of Document
1	Appajappa	253	1897
2	Venkatanaranappa	259) 260)	1859
3	Mallegowda	250) 261)	1864 1876
4	Eriah	252	1905

Bangalore,
13th November 1933

ADVOCATE FOR PETITIONERS

This is above Registration lands to be invited for a hearing - Records have separately been called for This will be placed in the connected file with return to the Dr

The case is ordered to be posted for personal hearing

G.S 21/11

21/11



73

ಕೋರ್ಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ-

ನಂ

ಸ 1933 –34

ವಾದಿ ಯಾ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ್

ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ ಯಾ ಎದುರು ಪಾರ್ಟಿ

VS

ಮಾ|| –|

ಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್ ನಾಮ

ಮುಂಡೆ ಮೂಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು

ನ ಪರ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ ತಕ್ಕೀರ್‌ನವರಿಗೂ ಕೋರ್ಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವಾದನನ್ನು ಜರಿಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೂ

ನ ಪರ ಆಗುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ನಿರ್ಣಯವಾದ ತೀರ್ಪುಗಳನ್ನೂ ಡಿಕ್ರಿಯಿನ್ನೂ ಜಾರಿ ಕ್ರಮ ನಡೆಸಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ವಸೂಲ್ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವದಕ್ಕೂ

ಕೋರ್ಟ್‌ನಿಂದ ನ ಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಬರುವ ಡಿಕ್ರಿ ಮೊಬಲಗು ಇತರ ಬಾಕಿ ಮೊಬಲಗು ಅಸಲು ಮೊಬಲಗು ಮತ್ತು ರಿಸಂದು ಮೊಬಲಗನ್ನೂ ಸಹ ಪಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೂ

ದಸ್ತಾವೇಜು ಮುಂತಾದವುಗಳನ್ನು ವಾಪಸ್ ಪಡೆಯುವದಕ್ಕೂ ಸಹ ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ತನಗೆ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾದ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೆ ಈ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಭಾಗಗಳಲ್ಲಾ ತಾವಾಗಲಿ ತಮಗೊಸ್ಕರ ಮತ್ತೊಬ್ಬರ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಾಗಲಿ ಕ್ರಮವರಿತು ನಡೆಸುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನೂ ನಾ ಖುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದು ನಡೆಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಇದೆ

ತಾರೀಖು

ಈ ಮೋಖ್ತಾರ್‌ನಾಮೆಯನ್ನು ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿದೆ ವ

ಈ ಮೋಖ್ತಾರ್‌ನಾಮೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯಸ್ಥರಾಗಿ ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷ ವದಲ್ಲಿ ರುಜುವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ

Pleader or Advocate

Sudharsana Press Hindupur

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

FINANCIAL SECRETARIAT

Dated Bangalore 23/11/ 1933

No 741 Muz 335-33-7 74

From

Financial Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore

To

The Mysore Commr

Sir

In forwarding herewith petition dated the 23rd November 1933 in original filed by Mr K N Srinivasan Advocate on behalf of Bandi Mallaiya of Kankanhalli one of the appellants in Muz Rev No 9 of 33-34 regarding the Degala-kutt lands in Kankanhalli, I am directed to state that in case the petitioner executes the necessary mutchalika in accordance with orders communicated to you with this office Memo No 1429/Muz 178-29-11 dated the 4th April 1933 as stated in para 6 of the petition, he may be allowed to continue to be in possession of the lands held by him pending orders on the Review petition filed by him and others before Government you

I have the honour to be

Sir

Your most obedient servant,

Sd S Shamanna

Financial Secretary to Government

Memo No 742 Muz 23-11-33

Copy of the above is forwarded to Mr K N Srinivasan Advocate Bangalore City

By Order

for Financial Secretary to Government

Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT

25

Immediate

Section Muz

File No 335-33

Serial No 7

No 741

To

The Hon'ble

Sir,

Diary No of letter replied to

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 193

Date of issue 25/11/33

Signed by Muddukrishnamma

In forwarding herewith petn dy 23 11 33 in original filed by Mr K N Srinivasa Advocate on behalf of Bandi Mallaya of Kankanhalli, one of the appellants in Muz Rev no 9 of 33-34 regarding the Vegila Mulu lands in Kankanhalli; I am directed to state that in case the petner execute the necessary muchalka in accordance with orders communicated to him while this office has

List of enclosures

Copied by

Examined by

WD 0677—GPB—15 000—8 11 33

No 1429 / Misc 178-29-11

Q 11 & 33 as stated in para 6 of the Petn, he may be allowed to continue to be in possession of the lands held by him, pending cross appeal on the Review Petn filed by him and others before Govt.

Share Etc

24/11/33 Addl Secy

GS 27/11

742 of 25/11/33

Copy of the above is forwarded to Mr. K. N. Srinivasan Advocate Bangalore City

By order

27/11

For Secy

GS 27/11

* File Schedule with T[illegible]



77

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore - Bangalore

ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ

1933—34 ನೇ Misc Revenue ನಂಬರು

ವಾದಿ ಯೂ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ್ Petitioners		ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ ಯೂ ತಪ್ಪೋನೆಂಟ್ Opponents
1 Hunge Gowda 2 Gurusaraji alias Appajappa	Vs	Sri Narasimhaswamy Devasthanam Kanakanahalli

ಮು|| ರಾ|| ಕೆ ರ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾರ್ಯ, ಎಂ ಎ ಎಲ್‌ಎಲ್ ಬಿ ಅಡ್ವೊಕೇಟ್
ಮು|| ರಾ|| ಆರ್ ಪಿ ವಾಸುದೇವ್, ಬಿ ಎ ಬಿ ಎಲ್ ಅಡ್ವೊಕೇಟ
ಮು|| ರಾ|| ಟಿ ನರಸಿಂಹ್ಮ ಅಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್, ಬಿ ಎ ಬಿ ಎಲ್
ಮು|| ರಾ|| ಬಿ ಬಂಡವ್ಪ, ಬಿ ಎ ಬಿ ಎಲ

ರವರಿಗೆ

ಒರಸಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್ ನಾಮಾ

ಈ ಮೊಖದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಆಜೈರುವರಿವಿಗೂ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವಾದ ಜರುಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ನನ್ನ ಪರ ಲಗವ ಎಲ್ಲ ವಿಧವಾದ ಅರ್ಜಿರನ್ನೂ ಡಿಕ್ರಿಯನ್ನೂ ಜಾರಿಕ್ರಮನಡಿಸಿ ಹಣ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವದಕ್ಕೂ ರಾಜಿವಗೈರೆ ಪೈಸಲ್ಮಾಡಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಒಗ್ಯೂ ನನಗೆ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ಸಲ್ಲಬ ಕಾಗಿರುವ ಡಿಕ್ರಿ ಮೊಬಲಗೂ ಶಿಲ್ಕು ಮೊಬಲಗೂ ರೀಫಂಡು ಸ್ಟಾಂಪು ವೆಳಬಲಗೂ ದಸ್ತೈವಜು ವಗೈರಗಳನ್ನು ವಾಪಸು ಹಡೆಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ಸಹ ತಮಗೆ ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಅದಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ತಾವಾಗಲಿ ಯಾ ತಮಗೊ ಸ್ಕರ ಮತ್ಯಾವ ಲಾಯಿಂಗಲಿ ಡಿಟೂ ಮೊಖದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡಿಸುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಖುದ್ದು ನಡಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಬದ್ಧನಾಗಿ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ

ಲ ಟ mark of Hunge Gowda

ಲ ಟ mark of Venkataramana

ಲ ಟ mark of Ramappa

ಈ ಮೊಕ್ತಾರುನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಗೆ ಪ ಚಯ ಸ್ಥರಾಗಿ ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ರುಜು ವಾಡಿರ ತ್ತಾರ

ಈ ಮೊಕ್ತಾರುನಾಮೆ ಆಂಗಿ ಕರಿಸ ಇದ್ದೇವೆ

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು

ತಾರೀಖು 23/11—1933

ವಕೀಲರ ಟ್ಸ್ Advocates

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat

No 811 Mysore
Muz 335-33-G

Dated Bangalore 12 - 12 -1933

From S. Shamanna, Esquire, B A ,
Financial Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore

To

N Madhava Rau, Esquire, B A , B L ,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore, Bangalore

Sir,

In continuation of this office letter No 741/Muz dated 25-11-33, I am directed to forward herewith petition dated the 23rd November 1933 filed on the 7th December 1933 by Mr K N Srinivasan, Advocate, Bangalore City, on behalf of Honge Gowda, Govindaraju alias Appajappa and three others appellants in Muzrai Review No 9 of 1933-34 re- the Degila Mutt lands in Kankanhalli, and to state that, in case the petitioners execute the necessary mutchalika in accordance with orders communicated to you with this office Memo No 1429/Muz 178-29-11 dated the 11th April 1933 as stated in para 6 of the petition, they may be allowed to continue to be in possession of the lands held by them, pending orders on the Review petition filed by them before Government

I have the honor to be,
S i r ,
Your most obedient servant,

Sd/- S Shamanna,
Financial Secretary to Government

P H

812/Muz Memo 12/12/33

Copy of the above is forwarded to Mr K N Srinivasan, Advocate, Balepet, Bangalore City

By order,

for Financial Secretary to Government

Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT

75

Section Mu3

File No 335-33

Serial No 9

Diary No of letter replied to

No 811 Revenue.

To

The H C

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193*

Sir, In continuation of this Office letter No 7911 dated 25-11-33, I am directed to forward herewith ~~in~~ 23 11 33 herein by ~~23-11-33~~ filed on 7-12-33 by Mr K N Srinivasa Advocate, Bangalore city, ~~to~~ on behalf of Honge Gowda, Gowdarajus alias Appajappa & three others abbellants in Mus Rev No 9 of 33-34 re the Degula Mutt lands in and Kankanhalli, ~~Gandasi~~ to state that, in case it be ~~is~~ ~~to~~ execute the necessa mutchalika in accorda with orders communicat herein with this Office

Date of issue 12/12/33

Signed by Mr B Muddukrishnappa

List of enclosures

Copied by 12/12/33

Examined by

WD 0677—GPB—15 000—8 11 33

Memo no 1429 / Mem 178-29-4
of the 11th Apl 1933 dismissed
as frivolous as stated 80
in para 6 of the pet, they may
be allowed to continue to be
in possession of the lands held
by them, pending orders on the
Review petn filed by them
& case disposed before Govt
Hqrs etc

9/12/33 for H Sec

Memo no 812 of 12-12-33

Copy to Mr K. N. Srinivasan
Advocate Bangalore City

B O

9/12 for H Sec

C S
9/12


COURT FEE
TWO RUPEES


FINANCIAL SECRETARY
2 JAN
No

1	[illegible]	7	1883
2	[illegible]	361	1882
3	[illegible]	358	

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

23 12 33

[illegible]

649 Rec'd Records
33-34

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE

Bangalore

REVENUE SECTION 83
892
7 FEB 1934
MUZRAI BRANCH

FINANCIAL SECRETARY
RECEIVED
No.

Madhava Rau, Esq., B.A., B.L.
The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore
Bangalore

Mug 335-33-11

C. Seshanna, Esq., B.A.
Secretary to the Government of Mysore
Financial Department

Sir

With reference to the correspondence ending with your letter No. 311/Muz. dated 12-12-1933 re Dhulla Kutt lands in Arkalgud I have the honor to forward herewith the entire records received with the Bangalore Deputy Commissioner's letter No. C3-1623/33-34 dated 1-2-1934 (Confidential Sec.) together with this office files Cs. No. Dis. 60/29-30 dated 14-9-1929 and No. Dis. 207/32-33 dated 21-4-1933 in which the facts of the case are fully set forth.

The review petitions received from Government in the cases noted herewith

and

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant

that
ents
rant

N. Madhava Rao
Muzrai Commissioner

3 I also undertake to confirm and ratify all the legal acts done by him in so doing

BANGALORE
10 8 1934

Accepted

P. Vasudevamurthy

Advocate for Opponent

Signed before me and personally known to me

P. Vasudevamurthy

Advocate

THE POWER PRINTING WORKS, BANGALORE

The Course ahead file before the Second Member's Case was heard and recorded

Second Member

Sd/- Lewis Cheeseman

16/6

GENL & REV SECRETARIAT 1323 21 JUN 1935 MADRAS

OFFICE OF THE SECOND MEMBER OF BOARD 16 JUN 1935

4/17/6 BRIEF SECRETARY 17 JUNE 1935

18/6

మేజెస్టీ సుంకరు శాసనసభ్యులకై నవస్తువులపై
ఎగుమతిసుంకము రద్దుచేయుటకు
ఈ దేశీయసరుకులమార్కెట్టు పెంపొందినయట్లు కోరి
వ్రాయుట

కొన్ని సరుకులు ఇక్కడకు సమీపంలోగల వారపు సంతలలో
కొనబడిన ఇసాంతిపాటి విలువగలవిగా ఉండుటవల్ల వివిధ
నదేశములకు మేజెస్టీ ప్రభుత్వమువారు విధించిన దిగుమతి సుంకములవల్ల
రతి ఫలితమును పొందుటకు వీలులేకపోవుచున్నది
నదేశములకు ఎగుమతిచేయుటకు ఇవి ఉపయోగపడుచున్నవి కాని - ఇదివరలో
అనుభవమునందు ఎంబడి ఆకర్షణకు అక్కరకు రానిసరుకులుగా
కోడి ఎగ్గులు నడ్డిగుడ్డు మొదలగు వస్తువులకై
నాశనమగుచున్నవి - దస్తూరి 268, 270, 271, 267 నెంబరు
రంగులతో మేజెస్టీ ప్రభుత్వమువారి 1853 సంవత్సరపు 10వ ఆక్టు
నందలి నిబంధనలప్రకారము ఈ వస్తువులకు దిగుమతి సుంకము
వసూలుచేయుటకు ఏర్పాటులేకపోవుటచేత ఈ సంవత్సరము
వాడబడుచున్న నిబంధనలవల్లనే ఈ పాత్ర తయారుచేయుటకు
నవసరమైన సరుకులు ఇక్కడ దొరకుచున్నవి

ఈ నవీన విధానము ప్రకారము ఇక్కడ నుండి ఎగుమతి
అగుచున్న 30/- రూపాయల విలువగల సరుకులపై
దుబాయి ప్రభుత్వమువారు సుంకము విధించుచున్నారు, మేము 30/- రూపాయల
బహుమతిగల వస్తువులను ఎగుమతిచేయుటకు ఇష్టపడుచున్నాము
మేము ఇక్కడ ఉత్పత్తిచేయు సరుకులపై ఎగుమతి సుంకము
రద్దుచేయుటకు మేజెస్టీ ప్రభుత్వమువారు దయతో
తగిన ఏర్పాటులు చేయుటకు ప్రార్థన

ఇట్లు
మీ విధేయులైన సేవకులు
ఎస్. ఎం. ఎం. ఎం. ఎం. ఎం. ఎం. ఎం.
ప్రొప్రైటర్లు

మేము ఈ క్రింది సంతకములను ధృవపరచుచున్నాము
ఎస్. ఎం. ఎం. ఎం. ఎం. ఎం. ఎం. ఎం.
తేదీ 22/- రూపాయలు మాత్రమే



ಕಂದಾಯ ಕಛೇರಿ ಮಾಲೂರು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ದಿನಾಂಕ 20ನೇ —

ಕಂದಾಯ ಕಛೇರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲಾದ ಅರ್ಜಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವರಿಸಿರುವಂತೆ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂಬರ್ 268, 270, 271 ಮತ್ತು ಇತರ ಜಮೀನುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ 15-12-3 ಎಕರೆ ಪ್ರದೇಶವನ್ನು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಉಪಯೋಗಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಸ್ವಾಧೀನಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ಮತ್ತು ಸದರಿ ಜಮೀನುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುವ ಕಟ್ಟಡಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಇತರ ಆಸ್ತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಪರಿಹಾರವನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಧರಿಸಲು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಭೂಸ್ವಾಧೀನ ಕಾಯಿದೆ 1894 ರ ಕಲಂ 4(1) ರ ಅನ್ವಯ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಹೊರಡಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸದರಿ ಜಮೀನುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುವ ಕಟ್ಟಡಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಇತರ ಆಸ್ತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಪರಿಹಾರವನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಧರಿಸಲು ಕಲಂ 9(3) ಮತ್ತು 10 ರ ಅನ್ವಯ ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ

కనుపర్తిపాడు గ్రామంలో ఉన్న పెద్దమ్మతల్లి ఉత్సవ
మహోత్సవాలు ఆదివారం నుండి ప్రారంభమయ్యాయి
ఈరోజు తెల్లవారుజామున అమ్మవారికి అభిషేకాలు
కనుపర్తిపాడు గ్రామంలో ఉన్నాయి.

ఈ రోజు ఉదయం 10 గంటలకు మహిళలు పొంగళ్ళు
11-00 గంటలకు గ్రామోత్సవం జరుగుతుంది. ఆలయ
ఆవరణలో ఉన్న చెట్లకు 12 గేదెలు, 21
ఆవులు, 2 ఎద్దులు, 1 దున్నపోతు, 2
గొర్రెలు, 1 మేక, 3 కోళ్ళు, 4 పందులు, 2
మేకపోతులు బలి ఇస్తారు.

గేదెలు	125-00
ఆవులు	15-00
ఎద్దులు	30-00
గొర్రెలు	35-00
దున్నపోతు	60-00
మేకలు	45-00
మేకపోతులు	50-00
పందులు	55-00
కోళ్ళు	58-00
దున్నపోతు	59-00
గొర్రె	60-00

ఉదయం 8 గంటలకు మొదలైన పొంగళ్ళు మధ్యాహ్నం
2 గంటలకు పూర్తయ్యాయి. 60-00 గంటలకు
ప్రారంభమైన గ్రామోత్సవం సాయంత్రం 6 గంటలకు
ముగిసింది.

ఈ రోజు 270 మంది మహిళలు పొంగళ్ళు 2-18 గంటలకు
11-00 గంటలకు నైవేద్యాలు సమర్పించారు. 73,
భోజనాలు 64, టిఫిన్లు 107, పులిహోర 1

పొంగళ్ళు	120-00
పాలకోవా	50-00

పొంగళ్ళు, పాలకోవా మొదలైనవి

ನಕ್ಷೆ 27 ಬಾಗಲಕೋಟೆ ವಿಶೇಷಾಂಕ 29 ಸಂಚಿಕೆ ಪುಟ 3-8-೦ ಶ್ರೀ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮೀವೆಂಕಟೇಶ್ವರ ಸಿನಿಮಾ 27, ಪುಟ 29

ಕೆಲ್ಸ ಪಕ್ಕಾ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರ್ — 30-೦-೦
ಪಟೇಲ್ ಸಲಕ್ಕೆ ಗಳು — 5-೦-೦
ಸಲಕ ಬಿಡುಸಕ್ಕೆ ಗಳು — 6-೦-೦
ಸಲಪ್ರ ಸಕ್ಕೆ — 7-೦-೦
ಪಡಿಲ್ಲಿ ಸಲಕ್ಕೆ ಗಳು — 8-೦-೦
ಸಲಕ ಬಿಡುಸಕ್ಕೆ — 9-೦-೦
ಬಗಸಕ್ಕೆ — 10-೦-೦
ಸಿಂದಕ ಸಕ್ಕೆ — 11-೦-೦
ಸಲಕಸ್ಸಿಗಳು — 12-೦-೦
ಸಿಂಬಲಗಳು ಕಪ್ಪಿರತಲು ಮಂ ಇಂಬಲಗಳು ಸಿಂಬಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗ್ಯಾಗಿ ಸಲಕ್ಕೆ ಗಳು ಸಾವಿರಾಂದಿಕೆ

ನಕ್ಷೆ 267 ಬಂಕಾರ ಮಲ್ಲು ವಿಶೇಷಾಂಕ 1-28 ಪುಟ 6-೦-೦ ವಿಶೇಷಾಂಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಕಟವಾದ ಅಂದಪ ಲಂಗಲಂದಿಗಿಳಿ, ಗಲಲಲಂ ಪೆಟಿಂಗ ಪಟಪಟ ಮಾಗಿ ತಂದ ಸಂಲ್ಲಾಪಗಳಿಂಲು ಬಂಧಿಲಲವದಂದ ಆ ವಿಶೇಷಾಂಕ ಸಂಪ್ರ 1-28 ಸಂಚಿಕೆ ಪಟಿಂಪ್ರ ಪಡಿಂಸಿ. ಪಟಿಂಡಿ ಗಿಲಂಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಪಸ್ಥೆಲಿಂಲಾಗ್ಯ ತಕ್ಷಿಲಲು ಶಿಂಗಿಕ ಸಲಕ 36, ಸಂಪಲಗಂಲಿಸಿ, ಅಆಇಈ, ಪಲಗಿಲ 4, ಕಿತ್ತಿಕಿ, ಹಿಲಕಳಿ 13, ಗಿಲಸಿ 1, ಸಂಸಿ 1,

ಕೆಲ್ಸ ಪಕ್ಕಾ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರ್ — 60-೦-೦
ಸಲಕ್ಕೆ ಗಳು — 10-೦-೦
ಸಲಪ್ರ ಸಕ್ಕೆ — 11-೦-೦
ಸಲಕಸ್ಸಿಗಳು 12-೦-೦
ಸಿಂದಕ ಸಕ್ಕೆ — 13-೦-೦
ಸಲಕ ಸಕ್ಕೆ ಗಳು 15-೦-೦
ಸಿಂಬಲಗಳು ಕಪ್ಪಿರತಲು ಮಂ ಇಂಬಲಗಳು ಸಿಂಬಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗ್ಯಾಗಿ ಸಲಕ್ಕೆ ಗಳು ಸಾವಿರಾಂದಿಕೆ

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE

MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

No. 'uz. Dated 82

Muzrai Review petition No 9 of 1933-34.

Review petitioners	Counter petitioner
1.Honge Gowda, Hallari Rao and three others. 2.Bandi Mallaiya 3.Appajappa and 3 others 4.Pone Gowda and 2 others	The Swamigalu of Sri Degila Mutt, Kankarhalli.

SUBJECT.

Request for a review of the decision of Government in Muzrai Appeal No.27 of 1929-30 regarding the Inam lands endowed to Sri Degila Mutt, Kankarhalli.

The case was called on 24th November 1934. All the review petitioners and Counsels Mr T.T.Rangachariar Iyengar, B.A.,B.L. on behalf of the 1st and 3rd set of petitioners and Mr.P.R.Srinivasan, M.A , LL B., on behalf of 2nd petitioner were present and were heard. The Counterpetitioner with his counsel Mr.B. Vasudeva Murthy, B A., LL.B., was also present and was heard.

ORDER

This is an application for the review of the order of Government dismissing the appeal by the petitioners against the order of the Muzrai Commissioner in Appeal No.C of 1928-29. The facts of the case and the reasons for the decision are fully stated in the previous order and require no reiteration. The main contention of the appellant's counsels was that though the petitioners did not claim by right of adverse possession they should be given the benefit of the proviso to Section 30 of the Religious and Charitable Endowments Regulation. According to

to the proviso, the alienations made prior to 31st December 1866 shall be dealt with in accordance with the usual rules contained in the Chief Commissioner's Notification No.266 of 17th November 1877. This must have reference to alienations which are recognizable under the law and in which a title has been secured by an alienee. The leases under which the petitioners are alleged to be in occupation now do not come under this category as any of them are dated even after 1853 and those given at an earlier date are not recognizable under the law as explained in the previous order. In these circumstances Government cannot accept the petitioners' contention and see no reason therefore to modify the orders already passed by them.

It was stated in the order of 11th April 1933 that it would be equitable to allow the petitioners to have in the first instance fairly long leases of lands on gutta amounts. The Counsel for the respondent stated that he had no objection to this. The Huzrai Commissioner is requested to keep this aspect in mind when the question of the period of new leases to be granted comes for decision.

91/Mag 2-8-35

Vasudeva Mudaliar

92/Mag 2-8-35

93/Mag 2-8-35

Muz 21]

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore

No. Muz. Dated

Muz Review Petn Appeal/No 9 of 33-34

~~Review Petitioners~~ Appellant — Vs — Counter-petitioner ~~Respondent~~

Hoge Gowda, Malleru Rao ~~and three others~~ and four ~~sons~~ of Banoi Mallaegh, Appajabba & three others, and ~~Subject~~ ~~Kere~~ Gowda, & two others

Subject

Regret for review of decision in muz appeal No 27 of 1929-30 regarding ~~the~~ Inam lands granted to Sri Vegila Vrutti, Kankanhalli

Shri ~~The case was called on 24.11.1933~~ All ~~Review~~ petns to (1)(2) & (3) were taken as pending and Counsel of the K T Bhashyam Iyengar and Mr K N Subba Rao on behalf of the 1st & 2nd petitioners on behalf of 2nd petr ~~Advocates~~ were present and were heard The counter petitioner with his Counsel Mr B Vasudeva Moorthy who also ~~was~~ present & ~~was~~ heard —

This is an application for review of the order Gone dismissing the appeal by the petitioners against the order of the Muzrai Circle No 6 of 1921

WD 0530—GPB—2 0—10 8 22

P T O

G R S App F G 3

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

(Continuation sheet draft form)

5/6

The facts of the case & the reasons for the decision are fully stated and in the persons over & require no reiteration - The main contention of the appellant's Counsel was that though the pltffs did not claim by right of adverse possession they should be given the benefit of the proviso to Sec^n. 30 of the Religious and Charitable Endowments ~~Act~~ Regulation & Vesting of the Properties, the alienations made prior to 31st January 1863 should be dealt with in accordance with the Imam only contained in the Chief Court's Notif^n No 266 of 17.11.1877 - This must have regard to alienations which are recognizable under the law & in which a title has been vested by an alienee - The lands under which the plots are alleged to be in possession do not come under the

3

Category - Many of them are leases
given after 1953 & those given
at an earlier date are not
recognizable under the law
as explained in previous order
In these circumstances Govt
cannot accept the ~~for~~ 'petitioners'
contention and see no reason Therefore
to modify the order ~~of~~ already
passed ~~previously~~ by them

It was stated in the order
of 11 4 33 that it would be
equitable to allow the ~~four~~ petitioners
to have in the first instance
fairly long leases of lands
on ~~quite~~ reasonable amounts -
The Counsel for the respondent
stated that he had no
objection to this - The M-C
~~took~~ is requested to look into
aspect in mind when the question
of the period of new leases
to be granted comes ~~up~~ for decision

G R S App F G 3

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

(Continuation sheet draft form)

90/Mis 82 8-35 GS
to Hon'ble Chief Secy Madras

1. ~~Copy to~~ the K.T Rhadakrishnan Esqr
Bar-at-Law Advocate for the
review petitioner in (1) & (3).

B-O
2/VII
for Gen Sec

No. 89 dated 2-8-35
Mis 335-33-12
Copy to the K N Seshadrayan
M.A LLB Advocate for
the review petitioner in (2).

B
2/VII
for Gen Sec

No 91 dated 2-8-35
Copy to the B Vasudeva
Moorthy BA LLB Advocate
for the Counter petitioner

B
2/VII
for Gen Sec

No. 92/Mis dated
Copy to M/s 2-8-35
returning
records received vide the
letter No 649/33-34
dated 2.3.4 The stay order
issued in this office letter No 7440 dt 25/11/
34 & 11 dt 12-12-33 is B O
withdrawn -
2/VII
for Gen Sec

GS
2-7-35

for Secretary
3/7

WD 0186—GPR—15 000—6 9 31

5-49 file.

93/Mcg The Law '49-331 & 2-8-35-

Law Secy wrote

ref re to the Notice issued

by Hon'ble Govt to Collrs

through Their Counsel

Mr K. T Bhashyam Iyengar

BA BL. with the

Connected File

2/7/49 for Govt sce

G.V

2/7

Register Sheet No - 91.

Taluk - Kanakapura

Hobli — do —

Village — do —

5-95

Register of Inams in the village of Kan Kan halli

CLASS EXTENT AND VALUE OF INAM

Number of case or entry relating to the Inam in the village	General class to which the Inam belongs	Survey No and name of field composed in the grant. Dry wet or garden	Extent: Local measure. Wherever the local measure is in acres guntas and annas, it is to be entered in this column	Extent: Measure in acres and their fraction in decimals
			Hg account of 1832	
	Devadeya		Inam Summary	
			K K P	
		Dry No 334	appropriate for dry only 0 - 17 - 14 1/4	
		Wet No 204 part	0 - 10 - 0	
		Garden No 202 204 part and 330	0 - 18 - 0	
		Old Survey Nos		New Survey Nos
		237 1 - 28	5 - 0 - 0	267
		246 2 - 14	8 - - 0	268
		247 1 - 3	3 - 8 - 0	269
		248 2 - 18	10 - 0 - 0	270
		249 0 - 29	2 - 4 - 0	271
		250 0 - 36	4 - 0 - 0	273
		251 1 - 24	5 - 0 - 0	274
		252 5 - 0	10 - 0 - 0	276
		253 2 - 6	6 - 0 - 0	279
		259 2 31	7 - 8 - 0	278
		260 2 - 4	3 - 8 - 0	277
		261 1 - 13	4 - - 0	291
Garden		274 2 - 0	6 - 0 - 0	299
		275 2 - 14	7 - 0 - 0	300
		277 2 - 30	9 - 0 - 0	275
		278 1 - 19	5 - 0 - 0	301
		334 0 26	3 - - 0	358
		337 1 - 14	5 - 8 - 0	361
		338 4 - 27	5 - 0 - 0	362
dry		339 4 - 28	5 - 0 - 0	363
Garden	343	1 - 25	5 - 8 - 0	317
		45 - 29	119 - 12 - 0	

Sammat of Kankanhalli in the Taluk of Kankanhalli. 107

DESCRIPTION TENURE AND			
Old assessment	Survey assessment	Description of land If fit for cultivation state whether the requirements of tank bund etc are sufficiently kept up If held temporarily or for life	Whether free of tax etc or liable to pay rent and if so amount of latter to be entered
Where no survey has been made and no assessment fixed by Government the rates paid by the ryot to the Inamdar on the average assessment of similar Government land should be entered			
6		8	9
Dry 2-6-13¼ 7-12-5/10 Wet 3 — 0 8-11-8 Garden 26-7-8 77-13-1 32-4-5-¼ 94-5-5-7	Cultivable 0-6-8 1-14-3 Site of house 0-6-8 Mango trees 33-0-13¼ 96-3-14 33-0-13¼	For Ket, Support of Ket Degad Mutt in lieu village called as per Amalu Cert of cate 43 in good order and hospitality to Shetrus them to the travellers	Free

Proportionate for dry crop

DOCUMENT IN SUPPORT OF

By whom g a ted and in what year	Wr tten instrumer ts in support of the cla m or gınal sannad all miscellaneous documents and other proofs of long possession In this col mn it shoul l be stated whether the Inam is held with or witho gra t whetl er the gra t is prouuced or l st etc and the general specificati terms of all documents produced should be given
10	11

NAME AND RELATIONSHIP OF ORIGINAL GRANTEE AND		
Name of original grantee	Name entered in the register prepared by Panchayat to 1810	Name entered in the accounts subsequent to 1810
12	13	14
		Agrant of 1832 Jangam Mari Sridala Vadaru
	Dry	2-0-0 6-0-0
	Wet	0-10-0 3-0-0
	Bagi	0-18-0 26 7-8
	Sale proceeds of Mangoe fruits	0-6-8
		3-8-0 36-4-0
		Granted in the year Prajotpatti

5-99 in file.

T. 1/103

of the

OF SUBSEQUENT AND PRESENT HOLDERS

Particulars regarding present owners. If the name has been added the name etc of each sharer should be entered in the columns

Residence name and age etc	Relation to original grantee or subsequent entered holders	Surviving heirs of the present incumbent	If unconnected with the original holders possession how obtained and in what year
15	16	17	18
Kankanhalli Degal Mutt and Gavi Mutt Manager Pro tem			

Division

109

LENGTH OF POSSESSION

Abstract of the orders already passed by the Commissioner or the Superintendent of the Division on lapses regarding validity or excess of the Inam Attempano and recommendation	Remarks by the Special Assistant and opinion by the Inam Commissioner
19	20

A Dakala case

1 Whole grant - valued

2 H J account of 1832 as it was a Subsequent grant

3 Total Extent K C P P 7 U
3-8-0 - 36-4-0

Inamdar Jungam Maral Siddanya Vader

Name of the Village		Description of land	Extent	Assessment	Whether Jaman or not	Trees	Amount of grant rent	Reg No	Case No	Remarks
A	1 Kankanhalli	Dry	0-17-14¼	7-12 10	Jaman	—	—	91	21	Confirmed to the grant
		Wet	0-10-0	9 11 8	do	—	—			
		Bagt	0 18-0	77-13 1	do	—	1			
		Sale proceeds of mango trees		1 14 3	do	—				
B	2 Omapadanna	Dry	1-2-1¾	9-10 5	do	4	—	169	3	
		Total	Dry	3-8-0	105 14 3					

4 Dakala B was a Dakala Village when the grant was made hence no mention was made in the Jama account It has since been made by the Revenue authorities as village the dry Inam enjoyed therein has proportionately been decided

5 A and B are to be confirmed free of tax under Rule V 1 7 P

(Sd) Syed Nalamudeen
26 2 " Assistant

GPB—1 009 b oks of 2 h t each—9-8-06

5-99 0 free

L 0 J

Renew by the Special* Agent
and* Confirmation by the
Indian Commissioner

20

Ashe and 1 Dakota-Personal, Jan
a A Confirmed free

(Sd) R A Cole
Superintendent Of
21 3 77 Indian Settlements

Lwd

"Copy"

Re Swatta
13 7 77
For Superintendent

Register Sheet No 149

Taluk - Kunigal

Village - Channasandra

— 99

106

Register of Inams in the village of Vempasandra

CLASS EXTENT AND VALUE OF I[illegible]

Number of case or entry relating to grant in this village	General class to which the Inam belongs	Survey No and name of field or fields comprised in the grant Dry wet or garden	Extent Local measure Given where the local measures are in acres guntas and annas it is to be entered in this column	Measure of acre in the fraction in decimals
1	2	3	4	5
3	Devadaya	Dry No 46 and 5-8	H J account of 18 Krishnaraj Proportionate K k P 1 - 2 - 1 3/4	
		Old Survey Nos	A G	Assessment R A P
		Dry } 2 Garden }	4 - 1 0 - 12	4 - 4 - 0 0 - 12 - 0
		Dry 3	5 - 11	6 - 8 - 0
		Dry 95	7 - 13	7 - 8 - 0
		Dry } 7 Garden }	0 - 13 1 - 19	0 - 4 - 0 4 - 4 - 0
		Dry 109	0 - 19	0 - 8 - 0
			19 - 8	24 - 0 - 0
		New Survey Nos -		
		Dry } 2 Garden }	4 - 1 0 - 12	
		Dry } 3 Garden }	5 8 0 - 3	
		Dry 95	3 - 23	
		" 140	2 31	
		Dry } 7 Garden }	0 - 10 1 - 7	
		Dry 109	0 - 19	
			18 9	

Sammat of in the Taluk of Kankavli

		DESCRIPTION TENURE AND
Old assessment	Survey assessment	Description of Inam If free it is to be stated whether the entire contained If for taking building etc whether they are efficiently kept up Hereditary or for life
Where no survey has been made and no assessment fixed by Government the sum paid by the party to the Inamdar or the average assessment of similar Government land should be entered in column 7		
6	7	8

9
With or free of tax etc or liable to quit rent and amount of latter to be entered

4 J acres
Kushwan Pa Jirayat
Rajpurkhan P Z U R A P
k k p
1-3 2 3/4 — 9-1 5
1-2 13/4

For the Sup
port of the
Degal Mutt
at Kankav
Kavli village
which has
Inam Sanad
Certificate
to run good
order (Under
such case)

Free

DOCUMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE INAM

By whom granted and in what year	Written instruments in support of the claim original sannad all miscellaneous documents and other proofs of long possession In this column it should be stated whether the Inam is held with or without grant whether the papers produced or list etc and the general specification of terms of all documents produced should be given
10	11

NAME AND RELATIONSHIP OF ORIGINAL GRANTEE AND

Name of original grantee	Name entered in the register kept by Poornaiah up to 1810	Name entered in the account subsequent to 1810
12	13	14
	—	H J account of 1832 Jungum Murla Siddiah Oulaur Kankanalla Jan Dry 2-0-0 6-0-0 Wet 0-10-0 3-0-0 Bagt 0-18-0 26 7-8 Sale proceeds of Mango fruits 0-6-8 3-8-0 36-4-0 Dry proportionate for this village Dry 1-2-1 3/4 +3-2 3/4

99 of the

of the

OF SUBSEQUENT AND PRESENT HOLDERS

Particular regarding present owners If the name has been subdivided the name etc of each sharer should be entered in the columns

Residence name and age etc	Relation to original grantee or subsequent entered holders	Surviving heirs of the present incumbent	If unconnected with the original holders passes singh wo ltaneh and in what year
15	16	17	18
Jankanlalla Degal Mutt and Gan Mutt Managers			

1110

Division

LENGTH OF POSSESSION

Abstract of the orders already passed by the Commissioner or the Superintendent of the Division regarding validity or extent of the Inam Attornpo and recommendation	Forwarded by the Special Assistant to the Inam Commissioner
19	20
Dakala Bench A No 21 of Kankanhalli Register Sheet No 911 To be confirmed free of tax Rule 10 (Sd) Syed Nasreen 26 2 77 Asst	1 Order Ack Devadaya Jan 2 Confirmed free (Sd) R A Fore Superintendent of Settlements Copy Asst Superintendent